National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 10. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1855. WHOLE NO. 790.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Published Weekly, on Saturday,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

PRESIDENT SHANNON PLEADING GUILTY.

A CARD FROM PRESIDENT SHANNON, OF THE MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY.

HAVING resolved, long ago, that I would take no notice of the malicious Free Soil calumniators who, week after week, hurl their envenomed shafts of detraction from behind the ramparts of a fictitious signature, I owe it to the people of Missouri, and to the interests of the State University, to publish this card.

Nearly six years ago, without solicitation on my part, the Presidency of the State University was tendered to me by a Board of Curators, with not one of whom I ever enjoyed the pleasure of a personal acquaintance.

During the last five years, I have devoted my best energies to the promotion of the educational interests of the State, rarely condescending to take any notice of the vile anonymous slanders that were industriously circulated. With what success I have acted thus, the wide-spread and growing reputation of the State University furnishes the best evidence.

Why, then, am I assailed unceasingly in the public journals, by anonymous calumniators, with such fiendish malignity, and with a zeal and perseverance worthy of a better cause?

To the intelligent, many of the assaults to which I allude furnish of themselves a ready reply. For making a public speech in defence of the institution of domestic slavery, I have been assailed as "The political priest, who is at the head of our State University"—"This madman"—"Our politico-religious priest"—"The bigoted and fanatical President of our State University," &c., &c. I have neither the inclination nor the ability to respond to such polite epithets; nor to honour, even by a kick, those who use them. But I have a few suggestions to make to *all honourable men* for the public good.

As President of the State University, it has become my duty, among other things, to instruct the young men of the State in the principles of Moral Science. The text-book here, and in American colleges generally, is Wayland's Elements, a work of high merit, except on the subjects of War, the Sabbath, and Slavery. It is well known, however, that Wayland exerts all the powers of his great mind to prove that slavery is "*semper et ubique*," always and everywhere a moral wrong.

Had I been satisfied to teach Wayland's views without note or comment, and thus *corrupt the minds* of the students committed to my trust, I would no doubt thus far *have secured the approbation of my present calumniators.* But, whether fortunately or unfortunately, I have committed an unpardonable offence, by believing, and teaching in the lecture-room and on "*the hustings*," that slavery is sanctioned alike by the Bible, the laws of Nature and the Constitution of the United States; and that Congress neither has, nor, *were it even a consolidated central despotism*, could it possibly have, the right to impair a vested right of property in slaves in the Territories, the District of Columbia, or anywhere on earth, to which the authority of the Federal Government extends.

Now, I submit it to all honest minds, whether, in a slave State, this should give offence to any but the most ultra Free Soilers and Abolitionists; and whether those who assail me on this account, do not prove themselves *the most shameless hypocrites* when they profess to be in favour of sustaining the institution of slavery.

To those who agree with me respecting the lawfulness of slavery, but doubt the propriety of my discussing it publicly, *if any such there be*, I remark that I have been impelled to the course I have taken, by the following considerations:

I have long believed that God had raised up these United States as his own chosen instrumentality for the regeneration of the world; and I regard the preservation of the Union as indispensable to the accomplishment of this sublime result.

Nevertheless, I am fully convinced that no created power can save the Union five years, unless the swelling tide of anti-slavery fanaticism be beaten back. To accomplish this object, and thus save the Union, I can conceive of no better method than to enlighten the public mind on the subject of slavery in its various aspects.

With these views, I feel impelled by the high motives of patriotism, and regard for the salvation of a lost world, to enlighten the public mind, to the utmost of my ability, on this absorbing subject. Indeed, I would consider myself wholly unworthy the privileges of an American citizen, unworthy the name of a man, or a Christian, were I to shrink from a faithful performance of this duty through the fear of any consequences that might result to myself personally.

If these views and this course of conduct render me unfit to preside over the State University, the sooner I am removed from my present position the better; *for the State of Missouri is too poor to compensate me for an opposite course, or even to purchase my silence on this thrilling topic.*

If it is desirable to have Free Soilism taught in the University, the people of the State will do well to instruct their representatives in the General Assembly, next fall, to suggest, to the bitter end, the efforts that will undoubtedly be made, by my present calumniators, to remove me from office, *per fas, aut nefas*, right or wrong.

If office, or even life, be sacrificed in an effort to save the Union for its own sake, and as subservient to the regeneration of the world, I can conceive of no better cause to which it could be devoted.

Pro-slavery journals everywhere are requested to publish this card; also such Free Soil papers as have aided in assailing me are expected to copy it *as an act of justice.*

JAMES SHANNON,
President of the University State of Missouri.

Columbia, Mo., July 9, 1855.

CASSIUS M. CLAY IN KENTUCKY.

THE following letter is from the Richmond (Ky.) *Messenger*. We have seen no mention made of the incidents referred to, in any other quarter:

MOUNT VERNON, Ky., Monday, July 2, 1855.

COL. JOHNSON—*Dear Sir*: On Friday last, I listened to one of the most remarkable as well as one of the most inflammatory speeches I ever heard. It had been published for some time that C. M. Clay was to address the people at Brush Creek meeting-house, in this county, on the Kansas and Nebraska bill; and, having a desire to hear that subject discussed, I went to hear him, but, to my disappointment, I heard but little upon that subject, it only being alluded to by Mr. C. in connection with the mob proceedings (as he termed them) of the Missourians, in the late election there, which it seemed, from the vehement manner that he spoke, was only done in order to arouse the passion of his followers, to put them in order to receive what followed.

He at once took up the slavery question, and, after depicting the awful sinfulness of the institution, and its blasting influence upon the community, and contrasting (in the most demagoguing manner), the most flourishing portion of some of the Free States with some of the most worn-out portion of Virginia and South Carolina, he said that he had come there that day to roll away the great stone—that it needed no more. He asked what their plan was for setting the negroes free; that their *motto was freedom on the soil*; that they were as much entitled to it as any man or woman on the ground, and that the time was close at hand when those who contended for remuneration for their slaves would be glad to get off even; for, upon the great principle of "doing unto others as they would have others do unto them," the negro would have a right to ask for a remuneration for his services.

He denounced, in the bitterest words, the old Democratic and Whig parties, and said they could not be trusted; and as to the Know-Nothing party, he gave it particular thunder, and seemed to have no confidence in any but the Free Soil party, which he said was now in the ascendancy; that their cause was now secure; and went on to show the strength of the party; and the number of negroes in the South over the whites; which, he said, in a conflict, would, of course, be added to the Free Soil party, so that they had nothing to fear; that the time had come to make a demonstration, and he for one was willing to do his part.

He then spoke of the treatment that John G. Fee had received at the Dripping Spring, in Lincoln County; that they had applied to the Court of Justice for redress, and had been refused; and he now intended that Mr. Fee should go to the Dripping Spring, and there speak his sentiments, as a freeman; and he intended to go with him and stand by his side; and if any man, or set of men, took him down, they should do it over his dead carcass. He then called on the crowd to know how many there were on the ground who would go with them, when a number of voices were heard that they were ready and willing to go. He then told them to furnish their rifles, if they had any; if no rifle, their double or single barrel shot guns, their Colt's revolvers; and if they had neither, then their kitchen butcher knife, for the thing had to have a beginning, and it had as well begin at the Dripping Spring as at any other place.

He said the time for the meeting at the Dripping Spring would be set in a few days, of which they should have due notice; and that they would meet and consult, and they would not meet in a barn, out-house, or any secret place, like the Know-Nothings, but in open daylight, like freemen. He said that the pro-slavery party, both in word and action, give the lie to the Declaration of Independence, but he would say, in the language of Patrick Henry—"Give us liberty, or give us death."

Now, Mr. Editor, it cannot be otherwise than admitted that Mr. Clay is a talented man, and it cannot be otherwise than true that he is one of the greatest demagogues in this country. He spoke most vehemently about the old parties stifling the Common School system, stating that the perpetuity of this country all depended on the virtue and intelligence of the people, knowing, at the same time, that he and those who he sends out, in all instances, go where there is the least education, to arouse the passions and prejudices of the people with their treasonable doctrines. Yours respectfully, W. H. KIRTLEY.

Selections.

EDWARD EVERETT AND HIS PRO-SLAVERY ANTECEDENTS.

THE 9th of March, 1826, Hon. Edward Everett made his first speech in Congress, on Mr. McDuffie's motion to amend the Constitution so as to take the choice of President from Congress, in any event. He went out of his way to justify slavery in the abstract. His sentiments on this subject were rebuked even by slaveholders, on the floor of Congress, and were received with horror and indignation through the North.

The Springfield (Mass.) *Journal* published the following notice of his speech, before it was printed, which notice was copied into the Boston papers.

"A friend, in allusion to Mr. Everett's speech, says:

"There is one part of Mr. Everett's speech from which the people of Massachusetts *will shrink with horror and indignation.* He entered into a vindication of slavery; said it was conformable to the practice of all nations, ancient and modern; was *justifiable* by the authority both of the Old and New Testament, and that the condition of the slaves in this country was far preferable to that of the peasantry in most countries of Europe. So *decided a vindication* of the practice of holding our fellow-men in bondage, I have never before heard on the floor of the House, *even from the slaveholding States.*"

This is the testimony of a political friend of Mr. Everett, who had just listened to what he relates. The press through the North condemned this part of his speech, though it lauded all the rest. Mr. Everett had time to reflect. He carefully wrote out his speech, and softened down the obnoxious expressions. It was not published till the 18th of March. The modifications he himself admitted in a subsequent speech, April 20th, 1826. On that day, Mr. Cambreleng, of New York, alluded to Mr. Everett's opinions on slavery, and said:

"I was astonished to hear him (Mr. Everett) declare that slavery, domestic slavery, say what men will, is a condition of life, *as well as any other*, to be *justified* by *morality, religion* and international law!"

Mr. Cambreleng then made a pointed parody on a part of Mr. Everett's speech against Mr. McDuffie, which he (Mr. C.) applied, with scorching sarcasm, to Mr. Everett's opinions on slavery, and added:

"The gentleman from Massachusetts must pardon me. His declarations were singularly extravagant. This was not the proper threatre for declaring such opinions, nor was it the quarter from which we might have expected them. Had they been expressed by gentlemen from the South, it might not have excited so much surprise. But coming from another quarter, and from a mind rich with intelligence, I heard them with astonishment. I attributed something to a momentary excitement that threw forth opinions which the deliberate judgment would reject, and I was happy to perceive that the gentleman from Massachusetts had himself *modified his opinions* in publishing them to the world."

This Mr. Everett admitted, in his reply to Mr. Cambreleng. He said:

"The gentleman has been pleased to intimate that I have since modified my views on this subject, and that my speech as printed does not, in this part, agree with my speech as delivered. Pains have been taken to carry this impression abroad. I take upon me, therefore, to say that there has not been printed this winter a speech more *nearly* as it was delivered than mine. I did, indeed, *consider* the extreme *delicacy* of the topic, and my friends were *desirous* that I should not be *misconceived*, as to views, *sound in themselves*, but which I might, in the warmth of the moment, have stated in a manner liable to misinterpretation. On this account, *anxious*, if possible, not to be misunderstood, though I knew I should be misrepresented, I did endeavour, in the printed report of my remarks, *so to express myself* that my opinion should not be mistaken. To this end alone was aimed *the slight variation of phrase* with which the gentleman's prompt and tenacious recollection has been so long burthened."

Here, Mr. Everett admits that he did modify his speech, at the suggestion of his friends, and that he did use the very phrase as quoted above by Mr. Cambreleng, so that we have it in the printed speech in the mildest possible form in which Mr. E. could place it. The Salem *Gazette* (a friend of Mr. E.) charged him with this alteration at the time. It said:

"The fact, no doubt, is, that Mr. Everett did express precisely the sentiments attributed to him, but, for some reason or other, *reduced* them to their present character in the speech which is printed, and which was unquestionably prepared by him for the press."

We now come to these sentiments, just as Mr. Everett chose to modify them, and write them, after nine days' reflection. We quote from a copy of his printed speech, authenticated by himself.

[*Mr. Everett on Slavery in* 1826, *March* 9.]

"Neither am I one of those citizens of the North who would think it immoral and irreligious to join in putting down a servile insurrection at the South. I am no soldier. My habits and education are very unmilitary, *but there is no cause* in which I would sooner *buckle a knapsack on my back*, and put a *musket on my shoulder, than that.*"

"I would cede the whole continent to any one who would take it—to England, to France, to Spain—I would see it sink in the bottom of the ocean, before I would see any part of this fair America converted into a Continental Hayti, by that awful process of bloodshed and desolation *by which alone* such a catastrophe could be brought on.

"The *great* relation of *servitude*, in some form or other, with greater or less departure from the *theoretic equality of man*, IS INSEPARABLE FROM OUR NATURE. I know of no way by which the form of this *servitude* shall be fixed, but political institutions. *Domestic slavery*, though I *confess* not that form of servitude which seems to be most beneficial to the master, certainly not that which is most beneficial to the servant, is NOT, in my judgment, to be set DOWN AS AN IMMORAL OR IRRELIGIOUS RELATION! I cannot admit that religion has but one voice to the slave, and that this voice is, 'Rise against your masters.' No, Sir. *The New Testament says, 'Slaves, obey your masters!'*—and though I know full well that, in the benignant operation of Christianity, this *unfortunate institution* disappeared in Europe, yet I *cannot* admit that while it subsists, and where it subsists, ITS DUTIES ARE NOT PRESUPPOSED AND SANCTIONED BY RELIGION. And though I certainly am not called upon to meet the *charges* brought against this *institution*, yet *truth* obliges me to say a word more on the subject.

"I know the condition of the *working classes* in other countries, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the slaves in this country are better clothed, and fed, and less hardly worked, than the peasantry of some of the most prosperous States of the continent of Europe.

"These are opinions I have *long* entertained, and long since *publicly professed* on this subject, and which I here *repeat.*"

Here we have the deliberate opinions of Mr. Everett, as published on the 18th of March, 1826. On the 20th of April following, Mr. Everett made a long speech on the Panama question, in which he gave his views of the Washington policy as to international interference.

Mr. Cambreleng replied, and combatted the views of Mr. Everett as to the policy of Washington. In the course of his speech, Mr. C. said:

"I am not opposed to the mission because the nations of South America have established universal emancipation. That this would be an objection with some gentlemen, ought to have been anticipated. This, Sir, is an interesting question, and, like the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Everett), I feel desirous that my opinions should be understood. No occasion can be more proper for expressing them than the present, when we are about to engage in consultation with nations whose constitutions vary from ours in this essential particular. My doctrines on slavery are the doctrines of our ancestors."

Mr. C. then followed with a severe rebuke upon Mr. Everett, to which Mr. E. replied. He had had full time for reflection. He now explained. How? [We quote from the *Intelligencer*, of August 1, a report acknowledged by Mr. E. to be his own.]

"Mr. E. said he thought it due to himself to offer an explanation of his remarks in a former debate. A highly distinguished member of this house had, shortly before, in a piece printed with his name, intimated that a portion of the citizens of the North would think it immoral and irreligious to assist in suppressing such a revolt [a servile war]. I disclaimed being one of those citizens, if any such there were. To justify this disclaimer (and not otherwise can it be justified), I said that slavery was sanctioned by RELIGION, morality and law. I meant, of course, Sir, slavery as it *exists* under the circumstances of the case supposed (that of a revolt to be suppressed in this country), and on the basis of *long standing political institutions.* This was the view of slavery in which I stated it had the sanction of morality and religion, possibly in the terms which the gentleman undertakes to remember with such precision, and with regard to which I will not undertake to contradict him.

"I did not justify kidnapping and the slave trade, as I have also been accused of doing, and by implication by the gentleman from New York, for he says my sentiments are fit for the Bazaar at Constantinople. I spoke of the relation of slavery as *existing with us*, where nearly two millions of individuals already stand in that relation; when the safety and lives of half the citizens of the United States are involved in it; when general emancipation is allowed to be attainable, *if at all*, only by an *exceedingly gradual process*, and in reference to a war of extermination and horror between these two portions of the population. In this connection, I DID SAY THAT SLAVERY, LIKE THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS OF SOCIETY, WAS SANCTIONED BY THE LAWS OF RELIGION AND MORALITY. IT IS AN OPINION I HAVE LONG HELD AND PUBLICLY EXPRESSED, AND WHICH I NOW REPEAT."

Let us see now how these modified opinions were received. We have room but for a small part of what would make a volume, and our quotations are from papers, except one, politically friendly to Mr. Everett.

[From the New York American, March 22, 1826.]

"Faults it (the speech) has, and one more startling than the rest, that which *justifies slavery* by the authority of the Christian Scriptures. The learned gentleman has been so intent on this justification as to have *made for the occasion* a new version from the Greek, having translated that word (Doulos) which, in our received edition of the New Testament, means *servants*, by the more questionable term, *slaves*; thus making the injunction of 'Servants, obey your masters,' read '*Slaves*, obey your masters.'"

[From the National Gazette, March 20.]

"The injunction of the same sacred volume, that subjects should obey their sovereigns, might with equal truth be quoted in favour of political as the other in favour of personal slavery. The Scriptures then would be presented to us in unavoidable alliance with *despotism*, instead of being, as they are, the harbingers of freedom to man in his present and future state. God forbid that the system of hereditary bondage, of the absolute property of one human being in another, *which formed the occasion* of the gentleman's remarks, should be deemed inseparable from our nature, or abstractly fit to be brought into comparison with voluntary service."

[From the New York Evening Post, March 23.]

"There are some positions advanced [in Mr. Everett's speech] which we strongly incline to question, and *one* in particular, that respecting *slavery*, from which *we cannot but* REVOLT."

[From the Boston Gazette, March 23.]

"The best feelings of our nature must *revolt* at such an opinion as he gives, 'that domestic slavery is not to be set down as an immoral and irreligious relation.' Again—'The New Testament says, *slaves*, obey your masters.' We had thought that the Bible, which the learned Professor used when he was pastor of a *Christian* church in Boston, rendered the text *servants.* He would, we think, be sorry to have it said, that because he was a servant of Middlesex, he was therefore their slave."

The *Boston Christian Register* of March 25, an Unitarian paper, conducted by the immediate personal friends said:

"The passage in Mr. Everett's speech which relates to slavery, though not exactly what previous report had represented it, is yet well calculated to occasion surprise. We must say that when the civilized world, beginning to be wide awake to the evil, is exerting itself to exterminate it, it is *mortifying* to hear a son of New England pronounce it neither 'an immoral nor irreligious relation,' and attempt to justify it from the Christian Scriptures. It is impossible not to see that the spirit of Christianity is wholly opposed to slavery.

"In what he says of the happiness and increase of the slaves, the *sophistry* is quite apparent, and would prove that their condition is preferable to the whites. In a word, all the power and splendour of this performance do nothing to diminish the regret with which we read *this passage*, contrary, as we conceive, *to the spirit of the Gospel, to the spirit of the age and to the mind of the country.*"

Of all the papers in all the land, the only one that attempted to justify Mr. Everett was the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, edited by a relative. The article in that paper, of March 28, appears to have been suggested by Mr. E. It elaborately quotes McKnight's Commentaries to justify Mr. E.'s perversion of the New Testament. But even that article admits that Mr. Everett justified the *continuance* of slavery, and held that no efforts should ever be made *here* for emancipation.

[From the Daily Advertiser of March 28.]

"It is one thing to justify the evil of slavery, and another thing to justify the *continuance* of the relation between master and slave. The first, Mr. E. did not attempt to do. That it was perfectly *right* in him *to do the latter*, we believe few reflecting men will doubt. We hold that it is not time, and NEVER WILL BE, that we should be roused to *any efforts* for their redemption (the slaves), as these attempts must be *worse than useless.*"

The speech of Mr. Everett on slavery has been a standing reproach ever since it was uttered. It was brought up against him in four elections to Congress, but he never explained. He was directly applied to by some of his friends, April 2d, 1835, when a candidate for Governor, on this subject. He had no explanation to make, other than his speech above quoted, of April 20, 1826. Abolition was then weak, and Mr. Everett, spite of his defence of slavery, had been four times reelected to Congress, and was twice elected Governor.

[*Mr. Everett on Slavery in* 1830.]

In 1830, Edward Everett made a speech in Congress on the Tariff. He argued to convince slaveholders of the great benefits conferred on the South by the tariff, especially as it regarded the *domestic slave trade.* He said:

"It is my deliberate opinion that, hitherto, the States most benefited by our laws for the protection of manufactures lie south of the Potomac. The Southern States have a monopoly of that species of property, I mean their slaves. The whole number of slaves is two millions. These, at $200 each, give a solid capital of four hundred millions of dollars. Now, without the Louisiana, or sugar-growing market for slaves, that *capital in slaves* would depreciate one-half, and be greatly liable to yet further depreciation—and here is one operation of the Tariff, *creating* to the Southern planter a *capital* of 200 millions of dollars, or 12 millions of dollars annually."

[*Mr. Everett on Slavery in* 1836.]

Edward Everett was now Governor of Massachusetts. Abolitionists had been mobbed everywhere. A great Whig meeting in Faneuil Hall had denounced them. Mr. Webster was a candidate for the Presidency. Southern votes were wanted. The Governor elect had received communications from Southern Legislatures, demanding gag-laws. His first message to the Legislature expressed his opinions on this subject.

"The country has been greatly agitated, during the past year, in relation to slavery, and acts of illegal violence and outrage have grown out of the EXCITEMENT kindled on this subject, which cannot be too strongly deplored, nor too severely censured."

Here Governor Everett deplores and censures the *excitement* kindled on the subject of slavery. That excitement was kindled solely by the free discussion of slavery. Thus he deplores and censures the discussion of slavery.]

"This compact (the Constitution) expressly recognises the existence of slavery. *Everything that tends to disturb* the relations created by this compact is at war with its spirit; and whatever, by direct and necessary operation, is calculated to excite an insurrection among the slaves has been held, by highly respectable legal authority, to be an *offence* against the peace of this Commonwealth, which may be prosecuted as a misdemeanour at common law."

Governor Everett then proceeds to give the reason why he could not recommend penal laws against discussing slavery. He does not hint that he is opposed to such laws himself.

"As the genius of our institutions and the character of our people are entirely repugnant to laws impairing the liberty of speech and of the press, even for the sake of repressing its abuses, the *patriotism* of all classes of citizens must be *invoked, to abstain from a discussion* which, by exasperating the master, can have no other effect than to render more oppressive the condition of the slave; and which, *if not abandoned*, there is great reason to fear, *will prove the rock on which the Union will split.*

"The voice of a numerous class of citizens at the South, who desire the removal of the evil, is silenced by the *agitation* of the question abroad.

"We should leave this whole painful subject where the Constitution leaves it, with the States where it exists, and in the hands of an all-wise Providence, who, in his own good time, is able to cause it to disappear."

This last is precisely what Mr. Everett said in 1826. Slavery was sanctioned by religion, and it must be left to the gradual operations of Christianity for this unfortunate institution to disappear.

Can this language be reconciled with a willingness that slavery should be discussed? But Governor Everett says his opinions are not changed. The above were his opinions in January, 1836.

[*Mr. Everett on Slavery, Feb.* 1836.]

Gov. Everett communicated to the Legislature letters from the Governors of Alabama and Virginia, and resolves from those States. The Alabama resolves say:

"We call upon our sister States to enact such *penal laws* as will finally put an end to the malignant deeds of the Abolitionists."

The Virginia resolves say:

"The non-slaveholding States are requested to adopt penal enactments to suppress all associations having the character of Abolition Societies."

They also say that "Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia."

Governor Everett silently approved the above sentiments. In his Message of Feb. 15th, transmitting them, he says:

"These documents relate to a subject to which the attention of the General Court has already been invited. They are accordingly submitted to the two Houses, *without comment*, and in the assurance that they will receive such consideration as may be due to the importance of the subject matter, and to the source from which they emanate."

Fellow-citizens, you now have the proof, the documents, in regard to the pro-slavery antecedents of EDWARD EVERETT. Judge for yourselves!

☞ We copy the foregoing elaborate and carefully prepared record of the pro-slavery sayings and doings of Mr. Everett from the *Boston Daily Advocate* of Nov. 6, 1837, as made at that time by BENJAMIN F. HALLETT, the editor of that journal, who, in view of his own base apostacy from the cause of freedom, at a later period, may possibly be refreshed and edified by its re-publication. It is a valuable historical document.

Our anti-slavery friends in Dorchester, who made so opportune and effective a protest in regard to the celebration of the Fourth of July in that town, with Mr. Everett as orator of the day, will find themselves abundantly sustained in their course by this record.—*Liberator.*

A HASTY CALL.

WHILE out riding with my husband, a few days ago, he suddenly suggested taking me to see how the negroes live. So, with a quick turn of the horse, and a "cheer up Roderick," we were soon landed before the fence, over which, and behind the trees, lay the little white-washed hut to which we were bound. We were soon over the stile, with all the three children up the path, and before the door, receiving the warm welcome of the good old mother, her son and daughter. "Come in and rest a bit." "We can't stay long," I replied, "this time, but will go in and talk with you a minute. Why, how clean you look. How white your floor is, and your dishes so nicely ranged against the wall. You must take a world of comfort here, with your children," forgetting for the moment they were *slaves.* "Oh, I do," said the mother, "only we moughtn't know but they mought be sold and taken away from me to-morrow morning." "Do you ever expect to be free?" "Oh, folks says we may be when my know much about it." "Does your daughter live here with you?" "Oh, no, she lives up to the house, and comes down to see me once in a while. She's a good washer and ironer, and a good seamstress, only she don't know much about cooking." "Let her go and live with me." "Oh, it's against the law for slaves in Virginia to hire out in Washington." Some bees at the door attracted my attention. "Whose are these?" I said. "Oh, them is ours," she replied. "We had one swarm which threw off other swarms, and them others, and so on, till we had about 40, which we've sold and made a trifle." Thus showing ambition and industry where there is any incentive, anything to work upon.

As we rose to leave, "What shall we give the children?" they said. The daughter took a beautifully-arranged but withered bouquet from a tumbler of water, hastily wrapped a bit of paper about the wet stalks, and gave it to my eldest little girl, while her mother brought each an *egg* for the others, and then, fearing Louise might want one, returned for a third. A queer gift, one might think, but which fairly brought tears to my eyes, showing, as it did, her desire to do something, and her inability to do more. The children first decided to have them boiled for breakfast the next morning, but finally concluded to put them under the old setting hen and hatch out chickens, as a more lasting memento of the kind old lady. Wesley accompanied us back to the fence, telling, on the way, of the little heart they had to improve anything, "as they mought be sold to-morrow morning, and could n't take nothing with them." And so we left poor old Dinah, or whatever her name "mought" be, sorrowing that so much ambition and kindness of heart should be thus blighted and withered.—H.—*Independent.*

Washington, June 30.

"QUESTIONS OF BIBLE MORALITY";

OR, REV. DR. SMYTH *vs.* THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

IT is Fast-day, and I naturally turn to the 58th chapter of Isaiah. I there read, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?"

Then I turn to the tenth page of the Report of the American Tract Society for 1853, and find the Rev. Dr. Smyth holding forth as follows: "This Society has nothing to do with political questions or social institutions. . . . It has to do with the way of salvation for lost men. It seeks to bring men out of the city of destruction, and guide them to the celestial city. To this, and TO QUESTIONS OF BIBLE MORALITY, this Society confines itself, and on this account it is that the door is open to it and it meets a welcome everywhere. But were it to add other doctrines or principles to its platform, were it to meddle with social and political questions, it would alienate the affections and good will of its friends, circumscribe its opportunity to do good, both denominationally and territorially, and forfeit that catholic and Christian title which is its glory."

And to make it sure, a celebrated Northern divine gets up and says: "ITS POLICY IS FIXED. The *lines are distinctly drawn, and Dr. Smyth has placed them fairly before us.*" So it seems that Isaiah's question about "letting the oppressed go free, and breaking every yoke," is *not* "*a question of Bible morality*," according to the Charleston orthodoxy proclaimed from the platform of the American Tract Society.

What a pity that the old prophet had no Carolina Doctor to "*draw the lines*" for him, and "*fix his policy*," so as to keep him from meddling with social and political questions," "forfeiting his catholic title," and introducing into his book such "sectional and sectarian" matter about breaking yokes" and letting bondmen "go free"? Who knows but that it was in chastisement for some such "meddling with social and political questions" that that good old man was finally "sawn asunder"? Who taught the Rev. Dr. Smyth and the Publishing Committee of the Tract Society that the question of Isaiah, about "breaking every yoke," is "sectional and sectarian," and *not* "a question of Bible morality"?

Middle Haddam, Ct., April 6, 1855.

METHODIST PREACHERS MOBBED BY ATCHISON AND STRINGFELLOW RUFFIANS.

To the Editors of the Chicago Democratic Press:

I HASTEN to inform you of another mob in Platte County. The Methodist Church North had an appointment for quarterly meeting near Forley. The presiding elder, preachers and congregation had assembled and concluded the morning service, and were proceeding, when a mob of about eighty armed men made their appearance. The congregation, it being warm, were seated in the shade in front of the house, and the preachers were inside. When Dr. Walker led the mob to the door where Rev. Mr. Morris was preaching, and seizing him, Mr. Morris drew his revolver and cocked it, when some one caught his arm and took it from him. The mob then rushed on him, yelling, "Hang him! shoot him!" Some in the congregation interceded for him, and, after a long parley, they consented to let him go, under a pledge to leave and not preach any more till they gave him permission. The rest of the preachers escaped during the disturbance, and the congregation broke up and dispersed The preachers were all armed with revolvers. They are aware of the threats daily made against them. The mob brought tar and feathers and hemp along with them. The excitement is great. These humble and pious ministers of religion will be driven out, and utter lawlessness prevail. In haste, TRAVELLER.

Platte County, Mo., June 30, 1855.

MR. JOLLIFFE IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

MR. JOLLIFFE, who recently went to South Carolina from Ohio, to carry into effect the will of Mr. Willis, bequeathing his property to his slaves, has published the following letter in regard to his reception and treatment there:

MESSRS. EDITORS: As something has been stated in newspapers respecting my treatment in South Carolina, it is due to some gentlemen in that State that I make a correct statement.

On the 29th of June, I went to Barnwell, in Barnwell District, South Carolina, delivered a letter of introduction to a gentleman in that place, and put up at a hotel. The next morning I was informed, by a gentleman who called on me for that purpose, that, near the town, there was a meeting of some persons from the country to consult in reference to myself, but that they had been persuaded not to molest me.

After breakfast, I was met in the hall of the hotel by two men, Capt. Walker and John Mixon, who stated that it was their purpose to take me back to Williston, and that a buggy was ready for me at the door. They assured me that I would be treated as a gentleman, and, upon my invitation, went into my room. I locked the door; Mixon seemed a little alarmed, but I pointed to my pen-knife lying on a stand, and assured him it was my only weapon, and reminded him that they were two to one. I then explained to them the purpose of my visit. I agreed to go with them as soon as I should pay my bill. When that was done, Col. Barney H. Brown (to whom I had a letter of introduction from Rev. Joseph T. Robert, of Zanesville) and other gentlemen took Walker and Mixon aside, and, after some conversation, induced them to forego their purpose of taking me from Barnwell.

Col. Brown and others then returned to me and told me that I had the privilege of remaining in Barnwell till I could transact my business; I replied that I claimed it as a right and wanted no privilege. I was then told that it was objected to me that I was an Abolitionist. I said to them, "I am an Abolitionist to the very core of my heart." After that, several gentlemen called to see me, and I was treated, not merely with kindness, but with marked civility and respect. I feel myself greatly indebted to Col. Brown and other gentlemen of the town for their kindness.

The whole outcry against me was raised, I believe, by heirs and *debtors* of Elijah Willis's estate, hoping, perhaps, to frighten me from the discharge of my duty, and perhaps with the silly expectation of having some influence upon their Courts in the adjudication of a controversy respecting the will.

I stayed in Barnwell until my lawyer told me there was nothing more that needed my personal attention. I then returned to Williston, and remained there till 9 o'clock Monday morning, when I took the cars and went to Virginia, on a visit to my mother, and returned home.

JOHN JOLLIFFE.

Cincinnati, July 16, 1855.

SINGULAR SLAVE CASE IN PHILADELPHIA.

From The Philadelphia Bulletin, July 19.

MUCH excitement was caused at Walnut street Wharf, yesterday afternoon, by the liberation of a slave family. It seems that a gentleman from Virginia, who is on his way north, for the purpose of embarking to Central America, was on board the steamboat Washington, with a female slave and her two sons. Just before the starting of the line for New York, one of the Abolitionists got wind of the affair, and a coloured man accosted the party, who were on the upper deck, and inquired of the woman if she was aware that, by the laws of Pennsylvania, she had only to step ashore with her children and they would be free. At the same moment the mother was [illegible] with business, and that the woman knew where she was going. The coloured man replied that he did not desire to interfere with him, but that he wished to inform the woman of her rights.

The mother stated that she did not know she was free, and expressed a desire to be at liberty. The Virginian then said that she could do as she pleased; if she wished to leave him, she could go ashore. He then reminded her of her three children in Virginia, and asked her if she wanted to be separated from them. "No, Massa," was the reply, "but I wants to be free." The slaves were then seized by the negroes present and hurried ashore. This proceeding was, however, not accomplished without a scuffle. The Virginian seized the coloured man who had first accosted the woman, and also collared a well-known citizen and prominent Abolitionist who had taken an active part in the matter. The latter threw off the slave-owner, who demanded of him whether he would be responsible for these people. The Philadelphian replied, "I will be responsible for every shadow of a legal claim you have upon them," and handed him his card.

During the scuffle, the officers of the boat, who seemed puzzled to understand the proceedings, interfered to prevent disorder. The Virginian went on shore and made an effort to obtain the assistance of the police. The latter declined to interfere. The woman and her two children were finally hurried up Dock street, and put into a cab, amid the cheers of the crowd. The vehicle was driven rapidly down town, and the discomfited owner was left to digest his mortification the best way he could. The Virginian stated that he was Minister to one of the Central American Governments.

From The Philadelphia Bulletin, July 20.

The slave case has assumed a more serious phase than we had anticipated. The Hon. John H. Wheeler, of North Carolina, United States Minister to Nicaragua, is the owner of the slaves who were freed on Wednesday afternoon, at Walnut street wharf. It seems that Mr. Wheeler and his servants had taken dinner at Bloodgood's Hotel, on that day, and had then gone on board the Washington for the purpose of proceeding to New York. While at the hotel, the fact of the party being slaves became known. Mr. Wheeler alleges that the slaves did not desire to leave him, and that they were stolen away in opposition to his and their will.

Yesterday, application was made to Judge Kane, in the United States District Court, for a writ of habeas corpus, to be directed to Mr. Passmore Williamson. The writ was granted, and made returnable at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. At that time, Mr. Vandyke appeared for Mr. Wheeler, and Edward Hopper for respondent. Mr. Hopper stated that he had appeared at the request of the respondent's father, as a mark of respect to the summons of the Court; that Passmore Williamson had left for Harrisburg, on private business.

Mr. Vandyke replied that he who had the wrongful possession of a person should be present to answer the writ of the Court; but if the party were not present, he would ask for an alias habeas corpus, returnable at such time as the Court might suggest. His Honour then fixed this morning at 10 o'clock, for the return of the writ.

The writ commands Mr. Williamson to bring in the bodies of Jane, Dan and Isaiah, the servants of Mr. Wheeler, to await and abide the decree of the Court.

Yesterday afternoon, Deputy United States Marshals Jenkins and Crossin arrested five coloured men on the charge of riot and committing an assault and battery on Mr. Wheeler at the time of the rescue of the slaves. Their names are Wm. Curtis, James Martin, J. S. Ballard, Isaiah Moore and James S. Braddock. The prisoners were taken before Alderman Freeman, and committed, in default of bail, for a further hearing at 11 o'clock this morning.

This morning at 10 o'clock, the return of the writ of alias habeas corpus was made by presence of the body to whom the writ was directed. Mr. Vandyke appeared on the part of the United States, and Messrs. Gilpin, Hopper, Pierce and Birney on the part of the respondent.

The respondent, Passmore Williamson, Esq., made a return to the Court to the effect that the bodies of Jane, Daniel and Isaiah, mentioned in the writ to him directed, were not now, and had not been at any time, in the custody, power or possession of the then respondent.

Mr. Vandyke briefly stated the facts of the case, as follows: The Hon. John H. Wheeler is a citizen of North Carolina. He has been, for some time, American Minister to a foreign power. He has been at his post in discharge of his duties, and was returning to it after a brief visit to the United States. He is the owner of three coloured servants, named Jane, Daniel and Isaiah. He was proceeding to New York, on Wednesday, the 18th, to embark for Nicaragua, and when on board, at the wharf at this city, with his three servants, the respondent came on board and asked those servants, or one of them, if they would like to be free. They told him that they wished to stay with their master, when the respondent and fifteen or twenty coloured persons took them forcibly from the custody of the master. The two boys cried to go back to Mr. Wheeler, but the respondent here, one Passmore Williamson, forced them away.

The companions and associates of Mr. Williamson seized Mr. Wheeler by the throat, as he was trying to prevent this outrage on his property, and said that, if he made any resistance, they would cut his throat.

Mr. Vandyke said that if he proved these simple facts, he proved the return false.

The point raised by the opposite counsel, he said, was that the Court would not go behind the return, but he asked that the Court now go into the question of the commital of the outrage, and prove, by evidence, the return to be false.

Mr. Hopper, one of the respondent's counsel, then asked time to prepare testimony to prove the return.

The Court said that if the evidence was gone into, and a *prima facie* case was made out, the Court must bind over the respondent on

Answer—It was, if they desired it.

Cross-examined — Wm. Still, a coloured man, first informed me of the matter; he laid upon my desk a note containing the facts; I told him to go to the wharf and attend to it, that I was going out of town; I afterward altered my mind and went to the boat; I was there before Wm. Still; I do not know who engaged the carriage; I don't know who had hold of Mr. Wheeler; I told Mr. W. I would be responsible to him for any damage his rights might sustain.

Question by Mr. Vandyke—Did you say his "rights" or his "legal rights"?

Answer—I do not recollect which I said; no man has rights that are not legal rights; I told Still to get the names if he could, and if they went to New York, we would telegraph there; he said there was nothing in the way of their remaining here, if they wished; I told him to hurry down to the wharf and see that their wishes were complied with; my first idea was to get out a writ of habeas corpus here, but, as there was no Judge in town, I thought it best to telegraph; I was afraid that, as the boat was starting, we would not have time to accomplish anything; Still said nothing to interfere; when I went down to the boat, I saw him talking to Mr. Wheeler; he is clerk at the Anti-Slavery Office in North Fifth street; Still was the only person on board I knew; I saw him this morning; we had a conversation respecting this case; we conversed as to the safety of the parties; he said they were safe, and that they would not return under any circumstances; he did not tell me where they were; I am Secretary of the Acting Committee of the old Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society; Mr. Still did not tell me at what time the party returned; I do not know who got into the carriage; I saw it drive off.

Mr. Vandyke contended that the respondent's testimony was no testimony at all. His statement was not sufficient to contradict the positive evidence of disinterested witnesses. It was apparent that these slaves were within the control of the respondent. The latter, the District Attorney contended, had disposed of this property, and he could reach it if he felt disposed.

The respondent was the ringleader in robbing the owner of his property. He then leaves town, and this morning early he has a conference with his companion in crime.

Mr. Vandyke went on to argue that the return to the West was not only an evasion, but absolute falsehood, and that the parties were under the control of the respondent. The District Attorney compared the respondent to a pickpocket who steals a purse and hands the plunder to a confederate. He urged, in conclusion, that the respondent had not purged himself of contempt, and that he was liable for it and for perjury.

The respondent's counsel, after consultation, determined to leave the matter to the Court for decision without argument.

Judge Kane said the case was so grave, and its consequences might be so very grave to the respondent, who might even pass into the condition of a prisoner, that he was desirous, before passing upon the two motions, to have time for reflection. In the meantime, bail might be taken in $5,000 for a further hearing on the second motion (on the charge of perjury), and the motion for contempt could go over.

He would also say, at the risk of its being considered extra-judicial, that if it is really in the power of the defendant to produce the bodies of the three persons, it would, to him (the Judge), be better for him to do so. Judge Kane said, in conclusion, that he would hold Mr. Williamson in $5,000 for a further hearing at the next Term of the Court, on this day week.

Bail was entered. The Court-room was densely crowded with spectators.

KANSAS AFFAIRS—GOV. REEDER'S MESSAGE, &c.

The *St. Louis Democrat* of the 17th contains the principal portions of Gov. Reeder's Message to the Kansas Legislature. The Governor begins by speaking of the importance of the position which the people of the Territory occupy, and the solemn trust confided to them of originating its institutions and moulding its destinies, and he admonishes them that it is their duty, under this responsibility, to "discharge all unworthy ends" and "in the spirit of justice and charity to each other," to "address ourselves to our task, and so perform it in the fear and reverence of that God who oversees our work, that the Star we expect to add to the National Banner shall be dimmed by no taint or tarnish of dishonour, and that when viewed from the trying and scrutinizing standpoint of the future, we shall be subject to no reproach, save that which springs from the inevitable fallibility of just and upright men." After this exordium, which may be considered not altogether out of place, considering the reckless character of the persons addressed, the Governor proceeds to give a summary of the laws of the United States and of the several Territories, applicable to Kansas, and of the common law, and the law of the province of Louisiana at the time of the cession. In this mass of legislation, he calls the attention of the members to the importance of declaring distinctly which of the previous laws are in force, and which are not.

The Governor next proceeds to the great topic of slavery. And we quote what he says on this point,

"There are many special subjects of legislation, some of which are expressly referred to you by the bill organizing our Territory, and others spring from the necessities of our community. Prominent among them is the question whether we shall build our government upon the basis of free or slave labour. Claiming, as we do, the same capacity for self-government as our fellow-citizens of the States, with a far greater, if not an exclusive interest in the institutions and laws which are to exist among us, compelled alone to bear their burdens, and entitled alone to claim their benefits, wisdom, justice and fairness would dictate that those laws and institutions, inside of the Constitution of the United States, should be moulded by ourselves, stimulated by the absorbing interest we must feel in them, rather than by the representatives or citizens of other States, who are no more competent to the task than we—who have no stake with us in their results, and who would most indignantly repel any offer of reciprocity from us in assisting to manage their affairs.

"The provision of a Territorial Organic Act secures us this right and is founded in the true doctrine of republicanism. It may be exercised in various degrees and in various ways, and whenever it is called into action it cannot legitimately be attended with that excitement which is incident to the agitation of the slavery question in the direction of an attack upon constitutional rights. An agitation of that kind such as we have seen industriously prosecuted in the past history of our country by the destructive spirit of Abolitionism, can never be productive of aught but evil, and is calculated, in an eminent degree, to obscure the glories of the past, to evoke the foulest spirit of discord among the citizens of our common country, and also to mar our brilliant future, if not to endanger the existence of our cherished Union. A want of fidelity to the solemn compacts of the Constitution and an attack upon the rights of the States which are guaranteed by it, can have no justification or excuse. This view of the case, however, is not to be confounded with the discussion and settlement of the slavery question in our Territory in its bearings upon the formation of our institutions.

"That has been referred to us as an open question by the legitimate action of the nation, and here it is not only the privilege but the duty of every man to speak his opinions freely and enforce them peaceably and fairly. Advocate and opponent stand on the same ground, and must mutually concede to each other the identical measures of right which they claim for themselves. Freedom of opinion and freedom of discussion without licentiousness are of the very essence of republicanism, at all times and to be peculiarly respected here. The permanent character and high authority of a State Constitution, and the fact of its submission to a direct vote of the people of the Territory, indicate that event as a signal occasion for the decision of that peculiar question. In the meantime, however, a Territorial Legislature may undoubtedly act upon the question to a limited and partial extent, and may temporarily prohibit, tolerate or regulate slavery in the Territory, and in an absolute or modified form with all the force and effect of any other Legislative act, binding until repealed by the same power that enacted it."

On the subject of the Indians, and the sale of intoxicating liquors, the Governor says:

"The presence in our Territory of so large a number of Indians, interspersed as they are with the white population, adds a feature to the indiscriminate sale of intoxicating liquors, which does not exist in other communities. A portion of them indulge, upon almost every opportunity, in the excessive use of ardent spirits, and the friends and enemies of prohibition who are acquainted with the Indian character, and its frenzied developments under the influence of intoxication, will probably all unite in the admission that special precautions in this respect are necessary, as well for the protection of the Indian against degradation, as of the whites against violence. The more estimable members of most of the tribes are using their influence to check this evil, and we should second their efforts, as well for our sake as their own."

The cause of education is commended to the attention of the Legislature. It is always better, says the Governor, to pay for the education of the boy than the punishment of the man.

Several paragraphs of the message are devoted to the consideration of other matters of legislation; the creation and defining of counties, the census, the judicial districts, &c. The population of the territory consists of 5,138 males and 3,383 females, and it is a fact worthy of remark, as peculiar to a great extent of this Territory, that they are not, as usual, collected about one point or along a frontier line, but are dispersed over a district of more than 15,000 square miles.

The governor also sent a special message, announcing the resignation of M. F. Conway, member elect to the Council from the VIth District. Mr. Conway's letter of resignation we subjoin:

To his Excellency A. H. REEDER, *Governor of Kansas:*

SIR: I was officially declared by your Excellency, on the 6th of April last, to have been duly elected a member of the Council of Kansas Territory from the VIth Council District of said Territory. I was also furnished with a certificate to that effect, authenticated by your signature, and the impress of the public seal. I beg leave now, most respectfully, to resign the position thus assigned me, and to return you the certificate I then received.

I am impelled to this course by what I believe to be due to myself, to the sanctity of law, and to the rights and dignity of the people of Kansas. In holding and exercising the trust reposed in me by the qualified voters of the VIth Council District, I would be required to unite with the body of men who are to assemble at this place on Monday next as the Legislature of Kansas, and to engage with them in making laws to govern the people of this Territory. This I cannot do without lending countenance to the authority they assume to exercise. I was elected to represent the people of the VIth Council District in the Legislature of Kansas. Should I offer, in pursuance of that election, to enter this forthcoming assemblage, I would thereby give by direct implication my own sanction, and the sanction of those whom I should represent, to the validity of its pretensions. I would acknowledge it to be the Legislature to which I had aspired, and to which the people had intended to elect me when they cast their suffrages in my favour. This I am far from being prepared to do. It is a fact which has travelled the circuit of the whole civilized world, that this Legislature has been imposed upon the people of Kansas by force of arms. Those who compose it, and those whom they represent and for whom they act, are alien enemies, who have violently seized the Legislative powers of this Territory, and now seek to disguise their tyranny under the form of constitutional enactments. Their legislature is substantially a provincial council, instituted and ordained by a daring and unscrupulous league in the State of Missouri and other parts of the South, to govern a people whose liberties they have ruthlessly stricken down. This fact has been placed beyond controversy by authentic details of concerted operations looking to this end, and of overwhelming violence at the recent elections, unparalleled in all our political history. The straightforward integrity exhibited by your Excellency, from the commencement of your official career, has been such as compels me to believe that, had the evidence of the atrocious outrage perpetrated upon the people in the election of this Legislature been put before you in the shape of legal testimony, your Excellency would not have hesitated a moment in setting the authority of your office as you have already done your personal and private influence, against the audacious usurpation. Under these circumstances it would be either fraudulent or pusillanimous in me to respect this as the Legislature of Kansas. I am not willing to do it. Whatever the timorous or the time-serving may suggest or advise, I shall do nothing of the kind. Instead of recognising this as the Legislature of Kansas, and participating in its proceedings as such, I utterly repudiate and reprobate it as derogatory to the respectability of popular government, and insulting to the virtue and intelligence of the age.

As an individual citizen of Kansas I am furthermore free to say to your Excellency, representing as you do the imperial authority of the Federal Government in this land, that while I am entirely disposed to pay all respect to the lawfully-constituted authorities, I am yet not willing, whatever power may command it, to bend my neck like a satisfied and gentle slave to the yoke of foreign tyrants. To do so would prove me recreant to all the lessons of heroism or of duty I ever learned. I am so unfortunate as to have been trained to some crude notions of human right—some such notions as those for which, in ages past, our foolish ancestry periled their lives on Revolutionary fields. And, however wide-spread may be the disrepute into which those puerile fallacies have fallen in these sterling and enlightened times, I am still bold to withstand their violation in my own person to the last extremity of just resistance. Simply as a citizen and a man, I shall therefore yield no submission to this alien Legislature. On the contrary, I am ready to set its assumed authority at defiance; and shall be prompt to spurn and trample under my feet its insolent enactments whenever they conflict with my rights or inclinations. Very respectfully yours,

M. F. CONWAY.

PAWNEE, Kansas Territory, June 30, 1855.

RUNAWAY NEGROES.

INFORMATION is wanted of Jane, David and Isaac, three persons owing service to Mr. John H. Wheeler, of Virginia, American Envoy to Central America. The three are supposed to be in this City. A week ago, they were in full enjoyment of all the patriarchal advantages of servitude; and in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, in spite of their teeth, they were wrested from the very arms, so to speak, of an indulgent master, and, amid severe but fruitless struggles, baptized into the chilly experience of freedom, and other prerogatives attending the earning and eating their own bread and butter. Their freedom was as involuntary as their servitude. They were probably unfamiliar with classic letters, and did not know that "Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow." It was Mr. Passmore (Qu. Pass-'em-o'er?) Williamson who struck it for them, not without some resistance on their part; but once at liberty, they seem to find it so genial and kindly that Mr. Wheeler may wait in vain at Philadelphia in the hope of whistling or bird-liming them back. Fugitives from freedom are so much rarer than fugitives from slavery that no act of Congress seems necessary for their capture and restoration.

For some days we have waited in the hope of reasoning ourselves into some sympathy for Mr. Wheeler. His case is a hard one, we have argued—at least, in one point of view. There were probably three or four thousand dollars' worth of souls and bodies, wholly his property, and which he desired to carry with him to the Isthmus, where voluntary service is costly, and official salaries minute. How much cheaper it would be for Mr. Wheeler to be served gratuitously. How natural to wish those about him in a foreign land who have, perhaps, from childhood shared his bread and his shelter, and, it is not impossible, his very blood. What state and weight it might lend to his mission to have it attended by a train of slaves. What danger in leaving behind him property so liable to lavish itself in the purchase of superfluous freedom. Mr. Wheeler exposed himself to all the perils of a transit over free soil in order to have the dignity and comfort of his little coloured escort. Thus much may be said for him.

Per contra, there is much may be said against him. Mr. [illegible] the United States are to been pronounced free. The Lemmon case cannot have escaped his notice. Admitting the remote possibility of that case being so adjudicated as to enable slave-owners *in transitu* to carry their live stock over our soil, such is not now the law; and, unless covetous of an opportunity to test the question personally, the Envoy exposed himself for the slightest possible gain, namely, the saving of the wages of three servants for a year or two, to peril of a very considerable loss—namely, the loss of their services for life. The venture, having turned out badly for him, has left him no right to complain. There is no hook about it on which to hang sympathy.

Mr. Wheeler may also be supposed to know that slavery is not permitted to exist in Central America. That confederation was the first State in the world to follow the lead of France in abolishing negro slavery; the decree to that effect bearing date April, 1824. Since then, involuntary servitude has been unknown in any of the States. With what possible notion, therefore, of decency or respectability, could Mr. Wheeler thus propose to introduce slaves into a free community—a community where the importation of such cattle is by law pronounced to be piracy? To justify this piece of disrespect, did he rely upon his credit as Envoy? To cover an act at once so silly, gratuitous and illegal, did he rely upon our national flag? Possibly no notice would have been taken of his presumption. Apprehension of difficulty might have silenced remonstrance. Is it the part of a gentleman to avail himself deliberately of such apprehension—to count upon it for immunity from the penalty of a misdemeanour? Had Mr. Wheeler been named Minister at St. James, could he have ventured upon going, like Vich Ian Vohr, with "his tail on"? Let us suppose, on the other hand, that Central American laws had taken their course, liberating the three slaves at the city of Gautemala, as they have been liberated at Philadelphia. What security have we that Mr. Wheeler would not have made such an event a source of difficulty between his own Government and those to which he is accredited—would not have procured, like Borland, the annihilation of the offending town? Could he be denied, with the transaction at Greytown standing, as a precedent, unrepudiated? If Government descends to be the instrument of private vengeance and private profit, must it not do as much for its own diplomatic agent, having, as he has, and the others had not, a shallow pretence of right on his side?

Upon the whole, therefore, we can get up no sympathy with Mr. Wheeler. The flight of his fugitives has probably saved us a disagreeable complication in Central America, where we have already involved ourselves sufficiently. It has spared us the first instance of a Republican Minister trailing slaves after him to his scene of duty, in contempt of local law. It has preserved us, we feel assued, from various records which unpleasant events on the Isthmus, arising from this pertinacity, had it succeeded, would have furnished these columns. It will induce Mr. Wheeler to procure better and cheaper service for money than his runaways would have afforded him for love. In fact, we are rather disposed to regard the subject a fair one for congratulation; and tendering them, we add a bit of advice, that if Jane, David and Isaac, sated with the sweets of liberty, return to the bosom of their master, he will have the good sense to carry them back to Old Virginia, and go to Gautemala without them. The institution is peculiar; let it remain so.—*N. Y. Times.*

PROGRESS OF AFFAIRS IN KANSAS.

From The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, July 23.

A PRIVATE letter of a Springfield emigrant to Kansas, dated at Lawrence, July 11, gives a report from Pawnee, that the Territorial Legislature, before adjourning to the Shawnee Mission, excluded the eight Free State members chosen at the second election, leaving only two anti-slavery members to fight the battles of Freedom. The House of Representatives passed the whole of the Missouri code of laws at a jump. It was also reported that Gov. Reeder had resolved to repudiate the Legislature, since its exclusion of the only members who had legal claim to their seats, and no longer to recognise it as the Legislature of Kansas, but to treat it in its true character, as the organized representatives of the Missouri mob. These were merely flying reports at Lawrence, but are not unlikely to prove correct.

The free settlers in Kansas are unanimous in their determination to repudiate the acts of the fraudulent Legislature and meet the consequences, whatever they may be. There is a growing conviction among them that they must either fight for their rights to the soil and to the common privilege of American citizens, or surrender everything to the Missourian ruffians.

Washington Correspondence of The Times.

We have now reached a definite point in the sectional Kansas struggle. There is no mistaking now the ground whereon we stand. It is shown by the first week's proceedings that the slave State party has complete control of the Legislature. They have passed a bill removing the seat of Territorial Government within the enemy's line. It has been taken to the suburbs of Weston, the head-quarters of Stringfellow and his gang. The Governor vetoed the bill for this object. It was promptly passed over his head. All the other measures of the Atchison platform designed firmly to establish upon a legal basis that slavery which has been introduced by fraud and violence, will be consummated in like manner. It cannot with propriety be said that the struggle between the North and South in Kansas is over, because there really has never been a struggle since the passage of the Nebraska bill in Congress. The whole matter was then decided. When the Administration joined its forces, as it has done, with Atchison's, every element of an equal contest was banished.

Now, the North has fairly presented to it a single alternative. It is either to submit in silence to the appropriation by the South of Kansas and Nebraska, and their speedy admission as slave States, or to reclaim its territory, reestablish the settlement of 1820, liberate the slaves now in the two Territories, and drive out the slaveholders there *by force*. The most stolid and moderate must now be satisfied that action and not words is required to remedy the great wrong which has been committed. To conclude long and well-written arguments against the surrender of the Territories to Missouri and the South, with the solemn declaration that the Compromise of 1820 *must* be restored—as the *Tribune* and *Evening Post* do—is mere impotent verbiage. The Compromise cannot and will not be restored. To talk about it is to waste time.

By the compact of 1820, the North surrendered to the use and employment of the South certain Territories, and took others in return, as a perpetual indefeasible possession. Of course, this compact was irrepealable, except by the mutual consent of the parties. No legislation could deprive the free States of the property which they took *as their share* in the division of 1820. The act of 1854 attempting to rob the North of the Territory and property secured to it by the treaty, is simply null and void. We must either hold our tongues and submit to be robbed, or we must resist the enforcement of that act of repudiation and robbery by armed organized force. We must drop the whole subject, or we must refer it to a Committee of 20,000 men, well supplied with artillery and Minié rifles, and a military chest. As an individual, I am entirely in favour of the latter method, and am willing to take my share in the dangers and the labours of carrying it out.

AQUEDAY.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1855.

WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

THE Twenty-first Anniversary of the Emancipation of EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND BONDMEN in the West India Islands will be celebrated on WEDNESDAY, August 1st, by the New York Anti-Slavery Society, in MORRIS'S GROVE, on the Long Island Railroad, one mile and a half west of Jamaica, and 12 miles from the city.

The Society and all others who choose to unite in the celebration will leave Brooklyn in a special train of cars, at 10 o'clock, A. M., and will be landed at the entrance of the Grove. Returning, they will take the cars at about 6 o'clock, P. M.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, of Boston, and Hon. ERASTUS D. CULVER (formerly member of Congress from the Washington District and now Judge of the Brooklyn City Court), will deliver addresses. Other speakers have also been invited, including ERNESTINE L. ROSE, of New York, and J. MILLER M'KIM, of Philadelphia.

A Band of Music has been engaged for the occasion, and the Committee assure the public that ample arrangements will be made to secure the comfort of those who may attend. Plenty of cold water will be provided, but families and parties will find their own refreshments, dining together in pic-nic fashion.

Tickets for the excursion, price 50 cents, and for children *half price*, may be obtained at the Anti-Slavery Office, 138 Nassau street; of Rowland Johnson, 54 Beaver street; of Lauren Wetmore, 14 Platt street; and of J. M. Hall, 20 Cedar street. Those who intend to go are earnestly requested to buy their tickets on or before Monday, July 30th, in order that the managers of the railroad may be duly informed of the number to be accommodated.

LAUREN WETMORE,
J. MORTIMER HALL,
OLIVER JOHNSON,
Committee of Arrangements.

Our friends who live in the vicinity of the city, on other railroads, will see that the hour fixed for the excursion will enable many of them to leave their homes in the morning in season to take part in the celebration. We trust they will avail themselves of this opportunity to unite in celebrating a day which every friend of humanity must regard as worthy of special commemoration.

THE WHEELER CASE.

THAT a lie will travel a league while Truth is pulling on his boots, was never more fully exemplified than in the late (so-called) slave case in Philadelphia. The North has become so accustomed to the insolence of the Slave Power, whether exercised this side of Mason and Dixon's Line or the other—whether perpetrated by the Southern despots themselves or their Northern myrmidons—that she yields an unquestioning obedience even in cases where a moment's reflection only is needed to convince her that, on the point at issue, resistance is both her right and her duty, and a far easier position to stand in even than that of submission.

The notion that the Constitution and laws of the United States are pro-slavery has become so firmly fixed in the popular mind, and the public action has been so long predicated upon it, that the mischievous belief has grown into undisputed existence—that no laws and no Constitution can be anything else. Because the Constitution requires the rendition of fugitives, and because the law accomplishes it, it is taken for granted that slavery is paramount and unquestionable in any part of the country, and that any coloured man, under any circumstances, is to be presumed a slave if any villain asserts it. It is neither legitimate in the Legislature nor the people of the North to question this supremacy, and so constant and unwavering has been its assertion, that neither the bench, the bar, nor popular opinion, as a general rule, pauses, for a moment, to yield unhesitating obedience the instant it is demanded.

But, bad as the Constitution and the laws are, they are not quite so bad as this. In a certain contingency, and to a certain extent, they allow and avow that slavery is over and above all things, but out of that circle they do yield to the Common Law, and are compelled to give place to the theory, at least, of liberty, and maintain the natural freedom of every human being whose slavery is not specifically provided for.

In the case in Philadelphia, if the circumstances that there transpired had happened in a slave State, every one of the persons instrumental in the release of the coloured servants of Mr. Wheeler could be proceeded against and punished as slave-stealers. If these servants had been fugitive slaves, all who helped them to freedom in a free State would render themselves liable to the penalty provided by the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. But it happens that neither of these contingencies belong to the case. Mr. Wheeler was not in a slave State with his slaves; neither was he pursuing or holding them as fugitives from slavery in a free State. Whatever may have been their relation to him at any former period, they were now as free as he was, invested with all the rights recognised by the law and by nature as belonging to free persons, and entitled to all the consideration and protection which civil government can give to the citizen. This is undisputed and indisputable: If they never had been slaves, of course they could not legally be made so now by anybody. If, at some former period, no matter whether remote or recent, they had been held as slaves of this Mr. Wheeler, they were his slaves no longer, by his own acknowledgment. He had brought them of his own free will beyond the jurisdiction of the slave States, and within the jurisdiction of a free State, and that act, it has been decided, over and over again, in the Courts of different States, both North and South, is a voluntary act of emancipation on the part of the master.

The woman, Jane, and her two sons, then were absolutely and positively free; as free as Mr. Wheeler himself, and under no more legal obligation to him than he was to them. He had no shadow of a right of control over their movements, and to attempt to exercise such control over them, against their wishes, was to render himself liable at law for any wrong which they might suffer. Neither could he pretend to any right of guardianship over the minor children, for they were under the care of their natural guardian—the mother.

Certain persons, it seems, having learned something of the previous circumstances of the lives of these coloured persons, naturally enough concluded that they might be ignorant of their legal rights, and that it would be an act of charity and mercy to inform them of them. Had they a right to do this? Unquestionably; the same right to do it that one has to give a loaf of bread to a starving beggar; to warn a passenger that a falling building was impending over him, or an abyss yawning beneath his feet; to caution any innocent and unsuspecting person that he had fallen into the company of another who would inevitably rob him of all he possessed, or betray him into some great danger to life or limb. And in so doing they were infringing upon no right of Wheeler's, for he had none, as regarded these poor people, that did not equally belong to every human being in Philadelphia.

But, on the contrary, the wrong was on the part of Wheeler himself in attempting to keep from Jane and her sons the information which these charitable persons wished to convey to them. Without doubt, Wheeler knew that the coloured people were free, but he was determined, if possible, to keep from them the knowledge of the important change that had taken place in their condition. He meant, in fact, to kidnap these free coloured persons, and he knew that he could easily accomplish it, if he could debar them from all knowledge of their rights. The man is, naturally, if not legally, a kidnapper, and we are by no means sure that he could not be indicted for that crime under the laws of Pennsylvania. At any rate it is evident that his interference with Williamson's wish to communicate with Jane and her children, was an insolent attempt to prevent Williamson from exercising an unquestionable right, and that it was prompted by no other motive than to entrap, if possible, a free woman and her free children into slavery.

The result was, naturally enough, some riotous proceedings. But who created that riot? Wheeler, and nobody but Wheeler. If one man falls upon and beats another; or if one man commits upon another highway robbery; and if a third party steps in to rescue, or to aid in rescuing the man so robbed and maltreated, does the law hold that humane third party responsible for the inevitable disturbance that ensues? There is not a Justice of the Peace, or even a United States Commissioner in the land absurd enough—though there is no mere business that the latter will not do for ten dollars—to rule that such is the law. And this is precisely a parallel case. It was Wheeler who created a riot in attempting to prevent some humane persons from exercising their unquestionable right of informing Jane and her children that they were free, and that he meant to kidnap them.

That Jane and her children were free persons there can be no question. That Wheeler meant to kidnap them is equally clear, inasmuch as he had kept them ignorant of their rights, and did all he could to prevent others from informing them of them. In continuing to hold them as slaves after they had thus become free was in itself a continued assault upon, and illegal restraint of, them of the most aggravated character; and for the disturbance which occurred, when well-disposed and peace-loving persons attempted to defeat his nefarious and infamous project, he alone should be held responsible. He is both a kidnapper and a rioter, and instead of Jane, her children, and others concerned in their rescue, flying to concealment, they should have boldly appealed to the laws for protection, and for the punishment of this bold and impudent defiance of her laws flung in the face of Pennsylvania Sovereignty.

BAPTISTS OF PENNSYLVANIA.

MESSRS. EDITORS: As a watchman upon the walls of Liberty, you are, doubtless, interested in whatever relates to the great principles you advocate. I send you this line to inform you, in some respects, of the sayings and doings of the Central Union Association (Baptist), in the kingdom of Pennsylvania. This body held its last anniversary with the church in Holmesburg, Philadelphia Co., on the first Tuesday in June. The opening sermon was preached by Elder J. M. Richards, upon the Duties and Responsibilities of the Gospel Ministry. It was an earnest effort to breathe new life into an effete subject. He did mention the condition of the slave, but in such a manner as to administer no rebuke to the slaveholder or his Northern abettor. The Association was organized by the appointment of B. R. Loxley as Moderator and J. M. Richards as Scribe; after which, the usual business was transacted. There did not appear a single ripple upon the placid waters; but there was manifest anxiety lest some imprudent brother would disturb the peace of Zion by thrusting upon their attention the "vexed" question, and thereby give aid and comfort to the "infidels," which, I suppose, would be "constructive treason," to say the least. The second sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Cuthbert, of Philadelphia, upon the Duties of the Church. Mr. Cuthbert having recently left a slaveholding church in Charleston, S. C., could hardly be expected to come up to your views of duty in regard to the slaves, and he passed them by on the other side. His was called the Missionary Sermon; but the heathen at our own doors were quite overlooked. The third sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Holmes, of Brooklyn, N. Y. This was also on the Duties of the Church, and could not have been excelled by Dr. Trimmer himself. He would have the careful that they do not cooperate with others out of its pale, but be sure that they do nothing within to disturb the peace of the dear brethren. It occurred to me that the house where he preaches statedly has its pulpit and pews well stuffed with the great staple of the South. Of this, you could probably give some information. Near the close of the session, the Rev. Samuel Aaron, of Norristown, the sturdy reformer, read a circular letter, prepared by himself, on the subject of restricted communion, before the body. He had been appointed to this duty the previous year. In his letter, it was more than hinted that man-stealing was as valid an objection to communicating with an individual at the Lord's table as sprinkling, and that stealing babies was but little more in harmony with the teachings of Christ than sprinkling babies; and, consequently, to reject the man who had not been immersed, while they continued to commune with the man-stealer, must appear to sensible men very much like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. This truly sensible and well-timed production was placed in the hands of a committee of Simon Pures, excepting the author, and they reported that all that part of the letter relating to communing with slaveholders be omitted, and the remainder published in the minutes of this Association, as its circular letter. Hereupon, an interesting discussion arose, and was participated in by Elders S. Aaron, J. Hall, J. Philips, J. Duer and B. Cheney in favour of the entire letter, and R. Lewis, W. M. Whitehead and others in favour of the committee's report. An aged man, from the First Church in Philadelphia, by the name of Wattson, arose and said that he had hoped that that black question could be kept out of the Association; also, that the Abolition question must always be thrust upon them. He seemed to have a holy horror for everything relating to the coloured man. The Rev. W. M. Whitehead gave us the information that Philemon was a slaveholder, and *doulos* always meant a slave, as every scholar knew; but there were some—whether scholars I will not say—who knew no such thing. The Rev. S. Aaron made one of his best speeches in defence of what he had written, and I need not tell you how he speaks when the spirit moves.

There were efforts made, during the discussion, to postpone it and have a season of devotional exercise, but they did not succeed. At length, the vote was taken upon the report of the Committee, and it was approved by four majority; thus saying that the God-dishonouring and humanity-crushing system of American oppression is no bar to Christian fellowship; and yet these men profess to consider themselves slandered when represented as occupying a pro-slavery position; but they do say by their acts that the atheistic practice of slaveholding is consistent with Evangelical religion. By such acts as these, the bands of the oppressor are made strong; and while a louder wail of wo ascends to heaven, the caverns of hell beneath resound with shouts of another victory achieved by orthodox hands.

A LOOKER-ON IN VENICE.

AT the Spring Half-yearly Meeting of the Western Christian Union, held in Bristol [England], May 9th, 1855, Rev. EDWIN CHAPMAN in the chair, it was moved by Rev. S. A. STEINTHAL, of Bridgewater, and carried by acclamation—

That this meeting has heard with the highest satisfaction of the course pursued by the United States Attorney for the District of Massachusetts in declining to push the indictments against Messrs. Higginson, Phillips, and Parker, for aiding a fugitive slave, and warmly congratulates those gentlemen, and the American Anti-Slavery Society, on the success of their efforts on behalf of the oppressed, and in support of that impartial liberty which is the inalienable right of every human being, without regard to clime or colour; that, from what is now transpiring in the United States, they indulge the hope that the time may not be far distant when the people of that kindred nation shall be true to the great principle of freedom, and when they will consider it to be a *glorious* and not a *guilty* deed to have aided the Abolitionists in their noble and Christian work, and to have rescued a fellow-creature from the cruel wrongs inflicted by slavery.

THE LEMMON CASE.—Gov. Clark has appointed Joseph Blunt and Erastus D. Culver, Esqs., as Counsel to be associated with the Attorney-General in the trial of the Lemmon Slave Case, on an appeal prosecution by the State of Virginia, in the United States Supreme Court.

LETTER FROM AARON M. POWELL.

GHENT, Columbia Co., N. Y., July 16, 1855.

To the Editors of the Anti-Slavery Standard.

SINCE my last letter, I have held, in this County, three meetings, of which I will give you some account.

On Sunday afternoon, July 1st, by invitation of the Rev. Mr. Welton, I lectured in the Presbyterian Church at Spencertown. Although at that time the weather was extremely hot, we had in the afternoon a very good sized and attentive audience. I spoke mainly of the character of American slavery, of its sad influence upon the religion and politics of this country, and also referred to our position as Disunion Abolitionists. At the close of the meeting I was again invited by the Rev. Mr. Welton in his own and on behalf of the meeting, to lecture at the same place, the following Sunday, July 8th, particularly upon the Dissolution of the Union, which subject I had not fully discussed.

Spencertown is the present abiding place of that notorious apostate and grovelling politician, the *Rev.* CHARLES EDWARDS LESTER, with whose history, as a *whilom Abolitionist*, "*our Consul to Genoa*," &c., &c., some of the readers of the *Standard* are already familiar.

Not quite a year ago, this renegade Priest and *pro-slavery patriot* came to one of my meetings in the town of Hillsdale, under the auspices, as I am informed, of a Mr. Overhizer, an ex-Member of Assembly, and of a stripling lawyer, of your City, by the name of Palmer, together with some disaffected Methodists, whose guilty quiet seemed to have been considerably disturbed by meetings that I had previously held there, and, on that account, desiring to interrupt the progress of my labours, they selected, as a fit tool for their work, the apostate Lester, who availed himself of our free platform, to grossly villify and slander Abolitionists in general and William Lloyd Garrison and Abby Kelley Foster in particular, and subsequently, as I was speaking in reply, to disabuse the minds of the people in regard to some of his abominable misrepresentations, he took his hat and, advising the people to leave, left with the largest portion of the meeting, the better part, a few only, remaining till its close. Their rowdyish demonstrations, however, as is generally the result in such cases, were rather an advantage than otherwise to our movement; thus verifying a passage in one of the *Rev.* Lester's speeches, as a delegate to the World's Anti-Slavery Convention, held in London, in 1840, wherein he says: "Ah, Sir, we have found in America, that men can be mobbed into principle, but they cannot be mobbed out of it; for that abolition which is cradled in the storm, is the only kind that has ever been worth having. Like the oak on our native mountains, it must battle with the tempests of heaven, if it would strike its roots too deep to be uptorn. *Let me point to my noble friend in the gallery*, WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, *whom I delight to honour.*"

As the report of the meeting at Spencertown, and the announcement that I was to speak there again on the subject of Disunion, went forth among the old fogies and time-servers, a wholesome storm of agitation was created, especially as, during the time that was to intervene, they were to have a Fourth of July celebration, with Lester as the orator of the day, the Union to be "glorified" to the skies, &c., and the minions of the Slave Power who reside there, headed, it is understood, by the *Rev.* C. Edwards Lester, set themselves to work to prevent my having another meeting, by appealing to the mobocratic elements—threatening to break up the meeting, and to offer personal violence. On reaching the Church, on the afternoon of July 8th, we found the doors barricaded upon the inside, and admission denied us, in which event, it is reported that the "*Union Glorifyers*" anticipated that we would hold our meeting in a small park, and that they were prepared to meet us there with rotten eggs, &c., and had arranged for an old-fashioned disturbance; however, after some delay, the doors of the Church were opened, and we went in—a goodly number of respectable people, and a delegation of the "*baser sort*," and, aside from the occasional demonstrations of *pro-slavery patriotism*, we had, after all, a very good and satisfactory meeting, one which was regarded as a triumph; and Lester, although, it is said, he had promised his friend to be present, was careful to keep out of sight.

I lectured again in this town yesterday afternoon, and had a very good attendance, and an excellent meeting. At the close of my discourse a spirited discussion ensued with Darius Cole, Esq., a Silver Gray Fugitive Slave Bill National Know-Nothing, on the Disunion question, in which the audience seemed much interested.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, Religiously or Politi[illegible] hour.

Yours, from the "Battle-field,"

AARON M. POWELL.

LETTER FROM KANSAS.

LAWRENCE, K. T., July 9, 1855.

MESSRS. EDITORS: As I suppose you would like to keep posted up in reference to the affairs of the Territory, and not to depend upon hearsay stories, like those of that famous letter writer from Kansas, in the New York *Tribune*, who seems to be travelling all over the country, but often travels quite wide from the truth in some of his statements, as he takes vague reports instead of what he knows to be true, I proceed to give you authentic information respecting the doings of the sham Legislature of Kansas. This information is obtained from E. D. Ladd, one of our representatives. The Legislature proceeded to exclude all members chosen at the second election, declaring it to be null and void. Eight anti-slavery members are thus excluded, and no legislators are left, except those chosen by the Missouri mob, and Mr. Houston who was chosen at the first election, by a free State majority. Mr. Conway, another one chosen by free State persons at that election, resigned. Mr. Chapman is a free State man, but was chosen by the Missourians, in order to blind the eyes of the Western free State men. The Legislature now stand 26 Representatives pro-slavery, and one anti-slavery. Eleven Council men pro-slavery, one free State professedly, and one vacancy—M. F. Conway, who resigned. The larger house wisely adopted the whole Missouri code of laws, drank whiskey, gambled, and both houses adjourned over the Governor's veto to the pro-slavery mission, near Missouri. Johnson presides over the Senate, and Stringfellow, of the *Squatter Sovereign*, over the House. We are all anticipating glorious times, in trampling under our feet the doings of this pack of scoundrels. For once, we fanatical Abolitionists are on "Uncle Sam's" side, for plainly, the Legislature has set at naught the principles of the Nebraska bill, the darling pet of Samuel. Our Legislature is a body of nullifiers, in every sense of the word, for the Government of the United States declared the Governor judge of elections, and he ordered a new election, and gave those rejected men their certificates. How can the President do otherwise than repudiate this Legislature? If he sustains it he should be impeached for treason. Do place this matter clearly before the country, and let the people see what a devilish rascal Pierce will be if he approves of the Legislature, as it is rumoured he will. Excuse my severe terms, but if we have got to fight, we might as well commence by swearing a little, for you know, no body can fight without swearing.

My health renders it necessary for me to to defer, at present, that "more interesting" communication alluded to in my last.

The Democratic party is on the alert here, and has already modestly proffered its services anew, as Union Saviour. Col. Lane, of Indiana, is to bear the standard of the cross, in this self-denying movement.

Yours for Liberty, C. STE

Portage Democrat an extract from the sketch of Senator Wade's speech:

"The potent cry of a dissolution of the Union, so long used as a bugbear to frighten timid grannies of the North (and all Northern grannies were not in petticoats) into submission to the South, was fast losing its potency. Some had seemed to think, that a dissolution of the Union would blot the sun from the Heavens, and that time would be no longer. How childish the nervous excitability, often produced by the cry of dissolution which comes up from the South. Should the Union be broken into fragments to-day, Ohio could, herself alone, form and maintain a free government which would command the admiration of the world. He knew he was treading on what some would regard as dangerous ground. He yielded to no one in attachment to a Union, just and equal, but to be just and equal the Union must be for freedom and not for slavery. The Northern people are not longer to be frightened from their propriety by the howling cry of dissolution, which has so long been coming up from the South.

"Masses of Northern men feel that a Union purchased at the expense of the rights and interests of freedom and free institutions, may be purchased at too dear a rate. They now demand new principles of action. They demand that the true principles of free government shall be infused into the National Administration. The ship of State had been drifting Southward long enough, pressing on with a pressure of sixty pounds to the inch. The Northern people now demand that the ship should be put about, pointed towards the North Star, and driven on under a pressure of one hundred and twenty pounds to the square inch, regardless of the despairing cry of the South, that the boiler will burst. If the boiler does not burst, then we have the proof that the ship is sea-worthy, her deck fit to be trod by the foot of freemen—if the boiler bursts, it only proves the worthlessness of her appointments.

"No slavery outside of the slave States, as has been remarked by my friend (Mr. Chase) who has just taken his seat, is the true position. Let it there be confined, without the power to expand, without the power to curse more of God's footstool—let the South hug the body of death to her bosom, and let them rot together if they will. Cut off the supplies. The National House of Representatives holds the purse-strings. Let every appropriation for the benefit of slavery be withheld. Let the twenty anti-Nebraska Representatives elected in Ohio last fall, when they take their seats, stand up on this principle. Were he a member of the House he would do it. Let the South howl, as howl they would—but let freemen be firm and true—let the North be united for freedom, and the work is done. The South, instead of being longer our master, with *impudent impudence* demanding more and more, will come begging at our doors.

"Let there be no more compromises. The day of compromise is passed. The South, in the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, has forfeited her honour. Who can rely upon her? Who can go bail for her adherence to any future compromise that might be made? She cannot be trusted. Northern freemen will not trust her. The issue is made. Thus far, no farther. Slavery outside of the slave States can never have another inch of territory to stand upon, *be the consequences what they may.*"

CORRESPONDENCE.

27 New Broad Street, 8th June, 1855.

To the Editors of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Dear Sirs: Having noticed, in a recent number of your journal, certain statements extracted from the Report of the Rev. James Vincent to the Committee of the American Reform Tract and Book Society on the subject of his recent mission to this country, and as those statements are grossly inaccurate, I have to request you will be good enough to give equal publicity to the enclosed communications, so that your readers may have an opportunity of hearing both sides of the question.

I have the honour to be, dear Sirs,
Your obedient servant,
L. A. Chamerovzow, Secretary.

27 New Broad Street, London, 8th June, 1855.

To the Chairman of the Committee of the American Reform Tract and Book Society.

Gentlemen: Having observed, in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* and other American papers, statements that profess to be extracts from the Report of the Rev. James Vincent to yourselves on the subject of his recent mission to this country, I feel it to be my duty to lay before you the correspondence which passed between Mr. Vincent and myself in relation to his said mission. I confine myself to this at present, as it is not my wish to become involved in a controversy with Mr. Vincent. I must, however, be permitted to express my deep regret that the Committee of a Society so useful as yours, and with the objects of which we so cordially sympathize, should have permitted such statements to go forth upon the mere *ipse dixit* of a prejudiced person, whose course in this country, as well as in yours, so far as I can learn, has not been such as to entitle his statements to be received without considerable abatement. The indecent attack Mr. Vincent has made upon leading members of this Committee and Society reflects far more disgrace upon him than it can bring dishonour on them. Mr. Vincent was not above asking them for their contributions, nor would he have considered himself contaminated had they responded to his appeal. To abuse and calumniate them for not having done so is at once as inconsistent as it is uncharitable and unchristian-like. It is much to be deplored that his attack should appear to have had your sanction. As publicity has been given to his report, I have to request that, in fairness, you will give equal publicity to this communication and its enclosures. I beg to forward you the numbers of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* containing the notices of your Society, as also a copy of our Annual Report for 1854, in which you will find another special notice of your Association.

I have the honour to remain, gentlemen,
Your very obedient servant,
(Signed) L. A. Chamerovzow, Secretary.

5 Hereford Terrace, De Beauvoir Town, Kingsland, Dec. 1st, 1854.

To the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

Gentlemen: As I am just now making arrangements to return to the sphere of my labours in the United States, I think it right to address a few words to you; and as this letter will be presented to the Directors of the *American Reform Tract and Book Society*, I will beg the favour of a written reply to accompany it.

The Committee will remember that I brought a letter from the above named Society, signed by the Secretary, introducing me, and to that letter no answer was returned, but by the Secretary, in a *verbal* communication. As the representative of one of the most important anti-slavery auxiliaries in the United States, I submit that the objections to commend the Society delegating me should have been given in writing, without placing me under the unpleasant necessity of reducing those objections to writing to present to the Directors.

The Committee will also remember that, when I had a thousand of my circulars struck off containing the address of your office, which I inserted under the impression that I had the best authority for, but which being disputed by the Committee, they, at the same time, exonerated me from any "blame" in inserting it, they, in a second letter from the Secretary, forbade the issuing of my circulars with the address of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society in them. This act of the Committee cannot be received as friendly—it is even opposition which I did not expect. It was not until April that anything appeared in the *Reporter* even mentioning the Society, and then not one word of commendation. None appeared afterwards until the Manchester resolution was sent for insertion in the *Reporter*.

The Committee will not be surprised to learn that the support which they refused the Society has caused my mission to be unsuccessful.

The Committee are also aware of the correspondence which I have conducted with the *Congregational Union*. That labour was such as to call for the most unwearied effort on my part at the time, when exciting intelligence from the seat of war was occupying the public mind; but, by means of private distribution of hundreds of copies of my letters in those directions where they were most likely to be effective, I succeeded, with the blessing of God upon my efforts, in getting the facts so completely before the public, and the influential part of that body, as resulted in the most signal demonstration against slavery, in its ecclesiastical relations, that has been made by any religious body in England since the hard and well-fought battles for freedom were fought in this country. Yet I had to do all this *alone*; not a single word of recognition was addressed to me by your Society, and in the *Reporter* for November there was no more allusion to it than if there had been nothing done.

Your Committee also know that I was about to attend the Conference. Yet, notwithstanding I was better qualified to speak to the resolution on the American Churches and Societies, from *actual intercourse* and my *official connection* with a Society which abounds with information on all these questions, I was not asked to speak; I had not even a copy of the resolution handed to me by your Secretary, and when I arose to speak was requested not, but to leave the subject in other hands.

Now, gentlemen, I am glad that that resolution was so well spoken to as it was by others; but, had I had but the time and opportunity to have addressed the Conference under other circumstances than those under which I did speak, I could have given the results of my own observation respecting the ways and means employed by the Churches and Societies in America, which oftentimes make them *appear* to be *anti*-slavery, while, in reality, their influence is for slavery. I am sorry to be compelled to lay these things before the Directors of the Society commissioning me, but it becomes my duty, and I have thought it best to lay them before you first. You will see that my reception and treatment by the Committee is to me anything but satisfactory.

I will submit an opinion, from which you may possibly dissent; but it is, that if you had, after satisfying yourselves of my authenticity and of the object itself, commended it fully to all the auxiliaries and friends of the slave throughout the country, large and influential meetings might have been gathered, much information have been spread, a great interest awakened, and while it would have added to the treasury of the *Reform Tract and Book Society*, would also have greatly replenished your own.

I remain, gentlemen, with great respect,
Yours faithfully, James Vincent, &c. &c.

To the Rev. James Vincent, *Agent of the American Reform Tract and Book Society.*

27 New Broad Street, 2d Dec., 1854.

Dear Sir: Your letter of yesterday's date was duly received, but owing to the extreme pressure of business, incidental to the closing of the Conference, it could not be submitted for the Committee's consideration. I shall, however, take the earliest opportunity of doing so, if, after receipt of this communication, you deem it desirable to press the point. I have, individually, no objection to lay your letter before them, any I may have and which I may express to you now, arising from a conviction that you are pursuing an injudicious course, in desiring us to place upon record a document that contains much is inaccurate, and which, should it become necessary to comment upon, publicly, would not serve you, or the very excellent Society whose agent you are.

On the 6th of January last, the following minute was entered on our books: "The Secretary read a letter from A. Benton, of Cincinnati, Ohio, introducing the Rev. J. Vincent, as an agent of the *American Reform Tract and Book Society*, and asking for the cooperation of this Society. The committee in recording their appreciation of the importance of the new Society, were of opinion that the objects of the agent's visit to this country are more legitimately within the province of the *Religious Tract Society*, and the Secretary was directed to convey to Mr. Vincent the views of the Committee."

I take leave to remind you, that you came to our office the next day, when I informed you that the Committee had passed the above resolution, and I further requested you to be so good as to permit me—as you chanced to have dropped in—to convey to you verbally the Committee's views.

It is possible I may have departed from the strict rule of official punctiliousness, in not conveying these views to you in a formal manner. Had you, however, experienced any difficulty in consequence of this omission, in communicating with your Directors, that difficulty would have been removed by an application to me.

The refusal of the Committee to consent to your continuing to date your circulars from the Office, was based upon sufficient reasons, which were explained to you at the time. You having issued *any* from our Office was the result of a mistake on your part. Permission was accorded you to have letters directed to you at our office, *for your convenience*, and for you to write your letters there for a similar reason, but not to constitute it your Office for the objects of your mission. As that was fully explained at the time, I should have thought it scarcely worth while for you to have broached it again, as a grievance.

I deny that your mission was not commended in the *Reporter*. Any unbiased person who will read the article you refer to, must come to a conclusion opposite to that expressed by you as your own. The Society you represent further received at the hands of private individuals, members of our Committee and subscribers to it, pecuniary support which I conclude you acknowledged by receipt. You will permit me to observe that, under the circumstances I have mentioned, your complaints sound ungracefully. I would further remark, that you were perfectly aware why no earlier notice of the Society appeared in the *Reporter*. It was wholly a question of arrangement of matter, and we were bound to insert that which had been standing in type, and had a prior claim upon our space, which is, after all, very limited. The resolution of the *Manchester Union* was inserted as an item of news. I even sent instructions from Paris, where it reached me, that it should be inserted, and matter was excluded to make room for it. Your Society—I hardly think you yourself—could not expect a monthly commendation to the exclusion of other equally important subjects.

That your mission should have failed, will, I am sure, furnish cause of regret to those who wished it well. But those who have any experience in these matters know, that the success of any undertaing very materially depends upon the manner in which it is conducted.

I beg to say that, the Committee were not, as a body, aware of your correspondence with the *Congregational Union*, though I think one member of the Committee knew of it. Your assumption is, therefore, gratuitous. Had they even known it, I feel satisfied that it would have been impossible for them, conscientiously, to have commended you, or to have encouraged you in the course you took. You only did your duty to the cause, by exposing the position of the *American Board*, and I believe you sufficiently single-minded to think you did not care to be complimented for it. It is, however, a question whether your mode of conducting the controversy was such as would command the unqualified approval of any bodycorporate.

As you are of opinion you were "better qualified to speak to the resolution on the American Church" than any one who was present at the Conference, it is not my wish to disturb the equanimity of mind that must arise from your entertaining so flattering a conviction. I am quite ready to admit that you rendered the cause service by the facts you submitted to the Conference, and cannot doubt but that had we been favoured by the extensive knowledge of Mr. George Thompson, Mr. Pillsbury, and the Rev. E. Mathews, not to mention that of others, we should still have found that you were better qualified than any of these gentlemen. I therefore, regret, that though the time limited to each speaker was only fifteen minutes, and you had twice that time, you were not able to occupy the whole sitting.

You are under an error when you say I desired you not to speak, but to allow others to treat the subject. I merely asked you to allow me to ask a question, and to let another gentleman have precedence of you. I may, by the way, remark that the Committee did not know you were about to attend the Conference. I was not myself certain of it, for you had not given me any decided answer; though I said, I thought you would do well to attend it. As it was quite open, you had the same privileges as any one else. Respecting the copy of the resolutions which you think ought to have been handed to you, I beg to inform you that it is not customary to place unapproved resolutions in the hands of any person. They were, until laid before the Conference, private, and you must have observed that the resolutions were read by myself, and that neither mover nor seconder had a copy of them. You do not give any reason why an exception should have been made in your favour.

I am sure the Committee will regret to learn that you consider your reception and treatment by them unsatisfactory. But I am also sure that the Committee will find in your letter abundant reason to confirm them in the opinion, that their course respecting you—whilst the only one they could consistently adopt—has proved also to have been the most prudent one. Whether, under the different circumstances you refer to, you would have been enabled to add "to the treasury of the Society you represent," appears to me to be pure matter of conjecture. You will, however, pardon me, I am sure, for observing that our Society is not in the habit of replenishing its own exchequer at the cost of an agent employed by another Society, even when that agent's mode of conducting his proceedings is such as to command success in his own case.

Writing to you privately, I may be allowed, Dear Sir, to express myself as I feel. I shall preserve a copy of this letter, nevertheless, in the event of your persisting in your request that I should submit your grievances to the Committee.

I am, Dear Sir, yours very truly,
(Signed) L. A. Chamerovzow.

Alexander Campbell, the founder of the sect known as Disciples, or "Campbellites," and whose ingenious defences of slavery from the Bible will be remembered by our readers, has ended his mortal career. He was a man of great intellectual power, but deficient in moral principle.

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.

Philadelphia, July 23d.

You have seen, and doubtless your paper of this week will contain a report of, an important Slave Case which occurred in this city last week, and which is now the general subject of conversation. The facts of the story are, in brief, as follows:

On Wednesday afternoon last, a note was received at the Anti-Slavery Office, stating that there were three persons at Walnut street Wharf, held as slaves, who wanted to be free. This note was sent to Passmore Williamson, the Secretary of the Old Pennsylvania Abolition Society. The object of this Society, as your readers are aware, is, as its name imports, the "Abolition of slavery and the relief of free people of colour held illegally in bondage." The Society has been in existence seventy years, holds its charter from the State, and had for its first and second Presidents Benjamin Franklin and Dr. Rush. Passmore is the Secretary of this Society, and this case, therefore, as will be seen, came legitimately under his cognizance. He repaired to the place indicated and found the persons of whom he was in pursuit; they were a woman and her two children—boys, say of 12 and 14 years of age. They were upon the hurricane deck of the steamer Washington, which was about to start for New York. The claimant, who proved to be the Hon. John H. Wheeler, United States Minister to Nicaragua, stood near them. Mr. Williamson informed the woman that she was in a free State and could have her liberty if she desired it. All she had to do was to go ashore and she would be as free as the person who claimed to be her master. Wm. Still, who was present, gave her the same assurance. Her reply to both was that she wanted to be free, and she seemed ready to go with them, but Wheeler detained her. He had at first tried to prevent Mr. W. and his friends from speaking to her, and failing in that did all he could by remonstrance and appeal to counteract the effect of their statements. He implored her to stay; and asked her if she did not want to see her friends in the South again. She said she did, but she wanted to be free. By this time, the bell was ringing, and the boat was about to start. There was a crowd and tumult, such as is usual at the starting of one of our line steamers; there was no time to wait. The woman was told to make her election; she could either remain and be a slave, or go ashore and be free. She signified in the most emphatic manner—when her master was not loooking at her—her desire to be free, and that at once. She was then led down the stairs of the boat and her children picked up and carried after her; one of them cried vociferously. Wheeler caught at the woman and tried to detain her. Mr. Williamson pulled him back and held him till she was out of danger from his grasp. She and her boys were taken ashore, and put into a carriage, and, amid the huzzas of the spectators, were driven off to a place of safety. There was a large crowd, including some police officers, on and about the boat at the time, but no one offered any resistance. All seemed to regard it as a work proper to be done, and to approve of the manner in which it was executed. Mr. Williamson behaved very judiciously in the affair, and discharged the duty imposed on him, by his office, in a manner becoming its importance. To the threats of Mr. Wheeler, he replied by giving him his card, indicating where he was to be found, if wanted, and saying that he would be responsible for the legal consequences of his action.

The next day, a writ of *habeas corpus* was sued out by Wheeler and served upon Mr. Williamson, requiring him to produce in Court the bodies of the slaves, and on the day following (Friday), there was a hearing of the case before Judge Kane, of the United States District Court. Mr. Williamson for return to the writ answered respectfully that the slaves were not now and had not been at any time in his possession; and that therefore he could not produce them. Mr. Vandyke, United States District Attorney and counsel for the complainant, objected to the return as insufficient and untrue in point of fact. Messrs. Hopper and Gilpin (Ex-Mayor Gilpin), counsel for the respondent, contended that the return was complete, that it was not competent to go behind it, and that if the charge of untruth were brought, it should be made the subject of another hearing and of a separate and substantial allegation.

Judge Kane volunteered the suggestion that, if the counsel for the complainant chose to adduce evidence to prove that the respondent had been guilty of *perjury*, he should, sitting as a committing magistrate, bind him over to answer to that charge. The counsel prompt to avail himself of the Bench's assistance, after the hearing of the testimony, including the statement of Mr. Wheeler, moved an attachment against the respondent, for contempt, in not producing the bodies, and also, that he be held to answer for wilful and malicious perjury. Mr. Williamson was allowed an opportunity to "purge himself of contempt," and he took the stand, and, under affirmation, made a full and clear statement of the whole transaction, so far as his knowledge of, or connection with, it extended. Judge Kane, in view of the gravity of the case, said he would take time to consider and examine it, and that in the meantime, the respondent must enter ball in the sum of $5,000 for his appearance next Friday morning, for a further hearing, at which time he would deliver a written opinion on the subject.

On the afternoon of the same day (Friday), five coloured men, named Wm. Curtis, J. S. Ballard, Jas. Martin, Isaiah Moore, and James Braddock were arrested and brought before Alderman Freeman, on the charge of riot, and assault and battery, and highway robbery, on the person of John H. Wheeler, and in default of $7,000 bail were committed to prison.

On Saturday, Mr. Williamson was again arrested; this time on the charge of highway robbery. He had a hearing before Alderman Freeman, and was held to answer in the sum of $2,000. At the same time a friend of James Martin, one of the coloured men above mentioned, entered the required bail, and an order was issued for Martin's discharge. He was in the employ, and had been for 13 years, of the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company, and was anxious to be out to resume the duties of his place; but it was no use, as it proved, for, on returning to his post, he learned that he had been discharged. The officers of the Camden and Amboy Railroad, it seems, do not approve of men in their service taking an active part in favour of Liberty. Measures have been taken to bring out the other four persons on a *habeas corpus* to have their bail reduced so that they may be released on security. This is the position in which the case and the parties to it now stand. A few remarks by way of commentary and I have done.

The pro-slavery papers of this city make a great hue and cry about the "outrage" which they say has been committed in this case. It is true an outrage has been committed—not *against* Mr. Wheeler, however, as is alleged, but *by* Mr. Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler had no business to bring his slaves to Philadelphia. He brought them here, contrary, as he himself admitted at one of the hearings, to advice received before he left Washington, and in defiance of our laws and in contempt of our public sentiment. It was an insult to the people of this city, and an outrage attempted upon the community.

Mr. Wheeler, in personal appearance and manner, is the last person in a crowd that you would take to be what he delights to style himself, "an accredited minister" of any respectable government. He is as ordinary a looking man as you would meet in a day's journey. His accent is marked by the peculiarities of the Southern plantation, and he pays as little regard to the rules of Lindley Murray as he does to the laws of Pennsylvania. In reply to the question as to whether he was a citizen of North Carolina, his answer was, with infinite pomp, "I have that hona, sa." That's a specimen of his manners. "I *done* it"; "I *seen* him"; "the boy hollered." That's a specimen of his grammar.

Judge Kane's course in this matter, it is generally agreed, was marked by the grossest judicial indecency. Instead of calmly hearing the case, leaving Mr. Wheeler to the care of his zealous and fully competent counsel, he lays aside the Judge, becomes a partizan, and volunteers the suggestion that if evidence is adduced to prove Mr. Williamson guilty of perjury he will bind him over to answer for that crime! Now, Mr. Williamson is a gentleman of unblemished character and the highest respectability, far above the suspicion of any offence against morality; and nobody better knew this, or had a better right to know it, than Judge Kane, and the attempt, gratuitously, to fasten upon him this imputation was infinitely base and unjustifiable.

The pretence that the woman was forced away is preposterous. She was exceedingly desirous to be free, and was prompt to avail herself of the opportunity.

This Alderman Freeman is a new officer, lately elected, and not yet known to the community. He is in a fair way, however, to be brought out of his obscurity. He requires five poor coloured men to find each the excessive bail of $7,000, while in the case of Mr. Williamson, a man of means and friends, he is willing to accept $2,000! Such an incompetent Dogberry ought to be prosecuted and punished for malfeasance in office.

I shall attend the hearing before Judge Kane next Friday and give you an account of the proceedings. M.

The Second Revolution.—The Inauguration of the Maine Law in New York. An Oration, delivered in Dryden, Tompkins Co., N. Y., July 4, 1855. By Samuel J. May.

This production is marked by the clear insight, the philanthropic spirit, and the earnestness of conviction and purpose characteristic of its author. We see not how it is possible to set aside the argument by which he vindicates the wisdom and necessity of the Maine Law without denying the right of the Legislature to suppress *any* crime by force. The Government that pretends to punish iniquity, and yet either cannot or will not suppress dramshops, the prolific source of crime in all its forms, ought itself to "shut up shop" and take itself out of the way as a failure and a nuisance.

Slavery in Nebraska.—The following editorial paragraph, from the Nebraska City *News*, shows that slavery and the traffic in slaves have already gained a foothold in that territory. The slaveholders are evidently determined that Nebraska as well as Kansas shall be a slave State.

Negroes for Sale at this Place.—We call attention to the advertisement of negroes for sale, which appears in another column. A company of gentlemen from Missouri, who have large interests here, have imported them for the benefit of our young and growing city. Nebraska City is now about twice or three times larger than any other town in the Territory. Help is much needed and but little to be had, for this reason slave labour is required. We are authorized to state that the same company have twenty more in Missouri, which will be brought to Nebraska City, if sufficient inducements are held out.

The Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Progressive Friends will, we are told, be ready for delivery to-day (Saturday), or, at the farthest, by Monday next. We are requested to state that packages will be forwarded, at the earliest moment, to Hamorton, Philadelphia, West Chester, Boston and other places. The proceedings will be comprised in a pamphlet of 96 pp., and will include two Discourses by Theodore Parker. The pamphlet will be sold to non-subscribers for 15 cents single; 8 copies for $1; 18 copies for $2 00. The postage on a single copy will be 6 cents prepaid; when not prepaid 9 cents. It will be sent, post paid, to any one who will send seven 3 ct. postage stamps to Oliver Johnson, Anti-Slavery Office, New York.

The Freewill Baptist Quarterly for July contains eight articles, as follows:

I. The Vital Forces of Mohammedanism.
II. The Reformation in England.
III. Philosophy of the Trinity.
IV. The Plurality of Worlds.
V. Free Agency and Special Providences.
VI. The Hermit (Poetry).
VII. Christ's Second Coming.
VIII. Contemporary Literature.

An engraved likeness of Rev. J. Phillips, for twenty years a Missionary of the Freewill Baptists in India, and who lately returned to his native country, stands as frontispiece to this number of the Quarterly. New York: E. H. Fletcher, 117 Nassau street.

Rev. Dr. Breckinridge to Mr. Sumner.—The Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, D.D., of Kentucky, has addressed a long letter to Senator Sumner in reply to the Lecture delivered by the latter in the Metropolitan Theatre, in May last, upon the Necessity, Practicability and Dignity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise. The Rev. Doctor paints a frightful picture of the consequences which must ensue if that Enterprise, as explained by Mr. Sumner, is pressed to an issue. His letter will be a great comfort to the Unionsavers in their extremity, and, in view of the ability and standing of the writer, is worthy of attention. Its ethics are those of the pit. We shall publish it next week.

The Panorama of Life and Literature.—We call attention to the Prospectus of this new work from the office of *The Living Age*—a work like that in spirit and general design, but less comprehensive in its scope, and put at a price which brings it within the reach of many who feel that they cannot afford to take a periodical so expensive as *The Age*. The first number of *The Panorama* contains matter of great interest and value, and we take pleasure in commending the work to the patronage of our friends.

The Diabolism of Slavery.—The following paragraph is copied from the St. Francisville (La.) *Chronicle*:

"Two or three days since, a gentleman of the parish, in *hunting runaway negroes*, came upon a camp of them in the Swamp on Cat Island. He succeeded in arresting two of them, but the third made fight, and upon *being shot in the shoulder* fled to a sluice, where the *dogs succeeded* in drowning him before assistance could arrive."

What must be the grade of civilization (!) in a community where savage cruelty like this creates no sensation of horror, but only of sympathy for those who lose their human chattels!

Radical Abolitionist.—This is the title of a new monthly paper, the first number of which has just been issued, and which is to be the organ of the "Central Abolition Committee" appointed at the Syracuse Convention. It takes the place of the *American Jubilee*, and like that is to be edited by William Goodell. It is issued from 48 Beekman street.

Littell's Living Age, No. 583, contains articles from *Hogg's Instructor*, *Frazer's* and *Sharpe's Mayazines*, and from the *Spectator*, *Examiner*, *Athenæum*, and other sources. The selections, as usual, indicate the rare judgment and severe taste of the editor.

Wanted.—A few copies of the *Standard* of May 12th. If any of our subscribers, who do not bind their papers, can send us this No. they will confer an obligation.

Summary.

Slavery in the North.—The President and faculty of Madison College, Pa., have resigned, and their resignations have been accepted by the Trustees. Difference of opinion on slavery is the cause.—*Phil. N. American.*

Vermont.—Vermont must have a remarkably moral and law-obeying population, for it seems that the jails of that State average only three occupants each. Three are entirely empty, two have but one prisoner each, two others have four each, one has six, and another seven.

We understand that at the meeting of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, at which the nomination of Hon. S. A. Eliot came up for confirmation, there were eighteen members present, and that the candidate received *four* votes out of the eighteen.—*Boston Telegraph.*

A coloured volunteer company, called the "Attucks Blues," made their first parade in Cincinnati, Ohio, on Wednesday of last week. They are said to be well drilled, well uniformed, and well officered. They were preceded by a coloured brass band.

Honour to Nebraska.—The Legislature of Nebraska has passed a law prohibiting the sale or manufacture of intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage, which went into effect on the 1st of April. The *Nebraskian* says that there is not an establishment in the Territory where intoxicating liquor is sold.

A Flourishing Settlement.—A company of Germans, about four years since, purchased a tract of 20,000 acres, on the south-eastern slope of the Blue Ridge, in South Carolina, and established the town of Walhalla. They now number over a thousand inhabitants, and constitute a fine and thriving town.

New School Church in Nashville.—Gerard Hallock, of New Haven, Conn., one of the editors of the *Journal of Commerce*, has loaned to the New School Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tenn., twenty-five hundred dollars, at six per cent. interest, for five years, and taken a lien upon the property to secure himself.

The Methodists in Illinois.—The Methodist Protestant Church of North Illinois, propose to hold a Conventional Mass Meeting in Centre Grove, Bureau County, Illinois, on the 17th August next, to agree upon some plan for separating said Church from its criminal connection with Slavery. Both ministers and members are invited to be present.

"Women's Rights."—The tonsorial art is very successfully carried on by two females at the corner of Shawmut avenue, and Canton street, and we are assured they equal the best of our "knights of the razor." Gallantry and comfort suggests that our South End friends should assist in this practical method of asserting "women's rights."—*Bost. Trans.*

Coloured Militia.—There has been a company of coloured men organized as militia in Providence, R. I., and the Legislature has granted them the use of the State arms. During the Revolution, Rhode Island furnished a large number of negroes who were excellent soldiers. Many attempts have been made to organize a company of blacks, but never before with success.

Seven slaves belonging to William McCoy and others of Pendleton county, Va., eloped a few nights ago, each taking a horse with him. They are doubtless making their way to Canada. A considerable number have run away from Pendleton and Hardy within a year or two, and some of them who are in Canada are in the habit of corresponding with their friends in their own neighbourhood.

Spiritualism among Negroes. — The *Petersburg Express* records a case occurring in that city on Thursday, of a negro man, who several weeks ago thought he received a communication from his father, who is dead, to come to him. On Thursday night he got up, saying he was going to his father, and after walking about the streets some time, laid down, saying "father, I'm thar." A woman who had been watching him, went up, and found him dead.—*Richmond Eng.*

The Next State Fair.—The New York Agricultural State Fair will open its Fifteenth Annual Exhibition at Elmira on the 2d day of October next. Spacious grounds, of easy access from the town, have been selected, and will be arranged with buildings and all other conveniences usually provided, and every effort made by the people of Elmira to accommodate the crowd that will attend in the most comfortable manner.

The Jamaica Difficulty. — The Norwalk (Va.) *Argus* publishes a letter which has been received by the Collector of that port, from the American Consul at Kingston, intended to give warning to all who may be likely to ship negroes (bond or free) to Jamaica, that they may expect trouble. In case of desertion, the negroes there prevent the recovery of the fugitives, and there is no treaty between the United States and Great Britain for their restoration.—*Jour. of Commerce.*

One of the Witnesses.—An old lady was subpœnaed to appear as a witness on rather a delicate case. She did not come, and a bench warrant was issued for her appearance, on which she was brought into court. The presiding judge thought it was his duty to reprimand her. "Madam, why were you not here before?" "I couldn't come, sir." "Were you not subpœnaed, madam?" "Yes, sir; but I was sick." "What was the matter, madam?" "I had an awful bile, sir." "Upon your honour, madam?" "No, sir, upon my arm."

Crystal Palace Americanized. — The Crystal Palace, admired for its beautifully light and yet very strong structure, has performed in part that for which it was created—that is, to exhibit to all the world useful and beautiful works in Manufactures and Art, all combining to show the wonderful resources of men in useful operation. After the grand exposition of the works of the Old World as well as the new one, it is now to contain the works of America exclusively. In October next, it will be the place for the Twenty-seventh Annual Fair of the American Institute.

A Coloured Centenarian.—Toney Proctor, a free coloured man, died at Tallahasse, Fla., on the 16th ult., aged 112 years. It is said he was at the battle of Quebec, as the servant of an English officer, in 1750, which is 96 years ago. He recollected this fact distinctly. He was at the beginning of the Revolutionary war in the vicinity of Boston, at the time the tea was thrown overboard, and afterwards at the battle of Lexington. He came to Florida long before the change of flags, and settled in St. Augustine, where he purchased his freedom, married and reared a large family. During the Florida war he acted as Indian interpreter for Gen. Harney.

The Pittsburgh Slave Stampede, of which we copied an account from the Pittsburgh *Despatch*, seems to be a very complicated affair. The negroes were the property of a deceased person named Lightfoot, late of Culpepper County, Virginia, who, by his will, provided for their emancipation. The heirs to the estate were his nephews, and the Capt. McHenry, who was in charge of the slaves at Pittsburgh, is a regular slave-driver, from which it was inferred that the negroes were being conveyed to a distant State to be sold, although the man in charge professed that he was taking them to Ohio to free them and settle them there.

According to the Constantinople correspondent of the *London Times*, the losses of life since the declaration of war are the following: Turks, 130,000; French, 70,000; English, 28,000; Russians, at least 230,000. Taking into account the mortality on board the ships of war and transports, and among the labourers of different kinds attached to the troops, and the losses of the Austrian armies of occupation and observation by the diseases of last Winter, it may be assumed that from 500,000 to 600,000 men have perished or become invalided since the commencement of the war, or about as many as were carried off by the cholera of 1831-32 on its first appearance in Europe.

A "Spiritual" Prediction. — The New England *Spiritualist* puts on record as a test, a communication received on the 30th of June from a spirit, to the effect that "Dr. Kane has recently passed away from the earth life, his mortal body having been crushed by the ice as he went after his crew, who had gone in search of land. His ships have been broken to pieces and destroyed, and most, if not all of his crew, are in the spirit land. The spirit also stated that he, in company with Dr. Kane, Sir John Franklin and others was last night in the Polar regions, and saw the remains of Dr. Kane, upon the ice, with clothes, papers, and his watch, upon which they saw his name, he having engraved it thereon, not expecting to escape, but hoping that it might possibly be found by some one in search of him."

A Bad State of Things.—The great city of Philadelphia is bankrupt. The administration of her affairs has fallen into the hands of a party suited to control and govern Ward elections, but totally incompetent to manage her finances. Even the public school teachers, females depending for their bread upon the prompt payment of their salaries, are without their monthly pay, and compelled to dispose of their warrants at a monstrous shave. With all her vast resources, the city is in the condition of a mendicant, begging from door to door for public charity. This condition of things can be traced to its legitimate cause—the inefficiency of the present Councils. The people will soon drive from power those who have brought about this disgraceful state of things.—*Del. Co. Republican.*

Slave Set at Liberty on Habeas Corpus.—In the matter of Celeste, a mulatto woman, alleged to be a fugitive slave, on *habeas corpus*—Before Judge Burgoyne.

This was an application for the release of Celeste, who was detained on board the steamer Mediator, late from New Orleans, on the ground that her passage was not paid.

It was claimed by the Captain that Celeste had been brought on board, by her master, John Wilson, and that said Wilson came with her to Cincinnati and left the boat yesterday morning, for the ostensible purpose of procuring money to pay her passage, and had not yet returned. Celeste had occupied a state room alone during the trip, for which he was to have been paid $20, and he was detaining her until her passage should be paid.

Celeste stated that her master brought her here to set her free, but the Captain knew nothing of this beyond what she had told herself. The Court ordered that she should be set at liberty.

T. J. Gitchell, Esq., appeared for the applicant.—*Cincinnati Gazette, July 7.*

Slave Case in Arkansas.—The Van Buren *Intelligencer* says that it has recently been decided by Judge Ringo, of that State, that slaves are not recognised as property by the laws of the United States. The case upon which his decision is based, is briefly this:

"Two negroes had been convicted of larceny in forcibly rescuing and taking away a slave woman from two gentlemen in the Creek nation. A motion was made by Counsel for the accused in arrest of judgment, on the ground that slaves were not known to the United States laws as property, which motion was sustained by the Judge, and consequently the two negroes were turned loose.

"Another negro, indicted in the same case, was also turned loose, a *nolle prosequi* being entered in this case after the decision of the Judge had been given."

The *Intelligencer* says that this decision "is undoubtedly law, but it is a bad state of affairs for those owning slaves in the Indian country; because there is no law to prevent the stealing of all the negroes in the Indian section, if men are disposed so to do."

"A Man Executed for Slave Stealing.—In Chatham County, North Carolina, Willis Hester was executed last week for stealing a slave. He denied his guilt, alleging that he purchased him from another, for the sum of eight hundred dollars."

We find the above in the Baltimore *Sun* and other papers, and presume it is true. Hester would not have been hung for the first offence of stealing any other description of chattel. He might have stolen a cow or a horse, and still be in no danger of hanging. Nay, he might have stolen a child, or even a wife of the best citizen of North Carolina, and still his life would not have been sacrificed. Why is it regarded as so much more criminal to steal a slave? Simply because slavery is so unnatural and unjust an institution, that it can only continue to exist by the constant support of the arm of power. All statutes must be enacted with reference to it. It must affect all the political and social relations of the people. It is itself a cruel and accursed wrong, and it must be upheld by cruelty and wrong. Mercy is incompatible with it; the light of knowledge is incompatible with it; justice is incompatible with it. The libertine who despoils the poor man's home, walks forth at noon-day; the knave who steals the rich man's slave is hung!

Just Tribute.—The *Delaware County Republican*, speaking of the Philadelphia Female Medical College, says: "In the management of the College, too much credit cannot be given to Dr. Elwood Harvey, the worthy Dean of the Faculty. Impressed by a sense of duty, he left a lucrative practice in this County, and in despite of the frowns and sneers of his fellow medical men, connected his fortune with the institution. At that time it was looked upon as a fearful crime to impart the secrets of medicine to a *mere woman*. Any man who has the moral courage to brave the prejudices of his *caste*, in a just cause, has a more than ordinary mind. We wish Dr. Harvey all the success he deserves, and hope he may live to see the institution over which he now presides, second to no Medical College in the Union."

Emancipation.—Last Monday, a meeting was held at Jefferson, Ashtabula County, to devise means to purchase the freedom of the seven children of Mr. Elick Wood, a resident of Youngstown, Mahoning County. Mr. W. was formerly a slave in Dyer County, Tenn., and purchased his own freedom. His children are owned by a woman named Margaret Dickey, of the same State and County in which he himself was formerly held as a slave, and their mistress will set them free for the sum of $4,000, though she has been offered $6,000 for them. The youngest of them is six years old, and the eldest twenty-four. The meeting, after examining the facts in the case, appointed Hon. Benjamin F. Wade, Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, and B. F. Hoffman, Esq., a Committee to receive all monies collected for this purpose, and also to negotiate for the freedom of the children. Here is an opportunity for practical philanthrophy.—*Cleveland Leader.*

Horrible Death from the Effect of Liquor.—The New Haven *Journal* says that the family of David Carrington, of Bethany, having been annoyed by an offensive scent, like that of decayed offal, made search, and discovered the dead body of a man among the underbrush. It was found to be the body of Henry Collyer, of Woodbury. It seems that he left home on the 4th, to have "a good time," was seen in Seymour on the morning of that day, where he procured a tin pail and went to the distillery of Stoddard Chatfield, in Bethany, and stole liquor enough to fill his pail and become grossly intoxicated. In the evening he probably made his way into the brush, where his body was found. When discovered, the body was in a sitting posture, with the pail of liquor before him, and his head leaned forward so as to completely immerse his face in the pail of liquor! A more terrible death than this, from the effect of li

Miscellaneous Department.

OLD SETTLERS.

THERE was a period of the world when the founding of an empire or of a city was a work of time. We look back with great veneration to the early days of Rome, Athens, Paris, and London. And, as is the case in other things, our veneration increases as our knowledge decreases. In our own time an unmannerly change has been wrought. States are yearly events. We might keep a register of towns and villages, as we do of marriages and births. Cities are turned off with the same celerity with which a bucket or pair of shoes is manufactured. In consequence, there is a strange violation of our associations. Should one be invited to attend a meeting of the *early settlers* of London with what awe would he anticipate the weird assembly of venerable gray-beards brought back in shadowy vision to life and observation! But in our land, and especially in the West, where everything is done upon a sublime contempt of history, a meeting of *old settlers* would bring together as jolly a set of youngsters as ever laughed and rollicked at a log-rolling or cabin-building. The fact is, that we do more in a score of years now-a-days, than in the lazy days of yore they did in five centuries. And a young man is a patriarch at twenty-five, and venerable without a white hair on his head!

We read last winter a pamphlet account of the first settlers of Rochester, New York; and to-day we have received a newspaper account of an *Old Settlers'* Meeting at Indianapolis, Indiana.

The rules admit to membership all persons who were at Indianapolis before the year 1827. Now, if we recollect aright, the place was first selected about 1820; so that seven years was the full period allowed for settlement. After that no one was an early settler!

It is not a little amusing to read the simple events of early days, and imagine the interest which will be felt in them five hundred years hence. What a racket it would make in the historical world if some lucky antiquarian should discover the place where the first cabin was built at Rome, or the name of the man who cleared off the timber from the principal streets in early days; or the names of the families that concluded to camp down upon the site of Athens, or the first impression of the men who concluded to make a settlement on the hills of Jerusalem! Can anybody tell us who cut the first stick of timber on the Boulevards? Can any one ascertain the name of the man who raised barley in Cheapside, or pastured his cows on the fields where Westminster Abbey stands? But we know some things quite as curious of New York city.

The ground on which Cincinnati stands was once offered for a saddle and bridle! It would be a strong horse that could carry the worth of that saddle and bridle now.

The names of the men who cleared Main street, and several other principal streets of Rochester, are written in a book! We have journals and letters, and various records which give to our eyes again the unbroken wilderness from Albany to Niagara! We know many of the first men who pushed out for exploration, and their opinions of the soil of half the richest counties in the State, while they were lying under the moist leaves, untouched for centuries with a single golden drop of sunlight!

But our object was not to indulge in these fancies of our own, but to give a few extracts from the accounts rendered at the Old Settlers' Meeting at Indianapolis!

The first paper at Indianapolis was the *Gazette*, published by George Smith and Nathaniel Bolton. The second name is familiar to all Hoosiers, and its owner bids fair to wear it honourably for years to come. A man need not be very old to be a Hoosier Cadmus. Samuel Maxwell gives an account of himself thus:

"In February, 1820, my father, John Maxwell, and others, came here. They came far in advance of civilization. Delaware Indians were still settled along White River and Fall Creek. The farthest Northern settlement from the Ohio then was at Sandy Creek, this side of Vernon. All was wilderness from there to the North. In moving, we had to make rafts to cross the streams. When we came near this point, we struck the Indian trace, near the point where Mr. McClung now lives, and the next day pitched our tents near the crossing of the Crawfordsville road and Fall creek. When we reached here, we had to live in a log cabin, and eat 'flat cake,' without 'shortening.' We had to fare roughly but never lived more happily. I was here living in that cabin, when the Commissioners came to select the seat of Government. They had visited several places, and finally selected this. I attended the first meeting in the place, which was held in the open air, in the spot now the Governor's Circle, and the congregation sat upon the fallen trees and logs."

Religious meetings under the trees in summer days are among the most memorable experiences. Rudely-dressed men, picturesque with jeans, linsey-woolsey, or skins, women nursing their babes and using the nearest bush for clothes-line and ward-robe, the twilight recesses of the forests on every side, the mild cadence of leaves sounding fitfully in the wind the sharp outcry of wild birds, or the dull hammering of the wood-pecker—what have our city churches to touch the imagination like these? An organ? Once let a thunder-storm burst over head and roar through the forests, and you will never hear such another organ in church or cathedral!

"John Maxwell (speaker's father) was the first Justice of the Peace in the county, and Corbly the first constable. The first case ever tried, I believe, was a charge of profane swearing preferred by Dr. Coe against some man. The speaker then gave a sketch of Dr. Coe's arrival here. The doctor had lived with Mr. Maxwell till a home could be built for him. In those days, corn was $1 per bushel, and it had often to be brought from Connersville; and when ground, three grains were knocked into two by the miller's toll. The fare was composed of fish and *pound* cake; the corn was pounded, the fine used for bread and the coarse for hominy."

Will any one tell us who was the first Justice of the Peace in Thebes? Who was first constable in Athens? Who was the first doctor in Rome?

"Mr. Maxwell closed with a brief account of his life after leaving here; had *organized Montgomery County and built the first cabin in Clinton County*, and feeling a strong desire to 'move' again, he let his wife choose between coming back here and going to Kansas; she chose to come here, and thus he said: 'I am among you again.'"

Here is a man for you! He organized Montgomery County. After founding the capital, started Clinton County, and now is only kept by his wife, in his old age (for he must be now nearly *fifty!*), from going to Kansas to extemporize several States before he dies!

General Hanna thus gives his experiences:

"When I came, trees were growing in the Court-House square, and no street was clear of timber, except a part of Washington. I knew every man in the place, and when I saw a person I looked at him, expecting and feeling sure that I knew him. Now, I know hardly anybody, and hardly expect to know a man when I look at him.

"In those days, we had nobody who was too lazy to work, or too proud to beg, if need be, but everybody was too honest to steal. The general rule with the settlers then was to help each other, everybody assisted everybody else, in all their labours and troubles, and the whole community were like brothers. I came here 40 years old, and I helped my neighbours to clear off their timber, and get in their harvests. We lived then upon venison and fish. We had little else, and I was a good hunter and fisher, I joined in all the sports and exercises of the time, could sing a corn-husking song, and dance reels, and was well prepared for all the social relations of the day. And even now, when I see these sports going on, I feel like one of Burns's 'Twa dogs;' I want to be 'barkin wi 'em'"

Demas McFarland, among other reminiscences, gives the following military items:

"My next appearance in public life was when the militia were organized. I was requested to run for captain, but refused. There was no election in consequence. The colonel threatened, if officers were not elected, to transfer us to the organization at Indian Creek, which would take us a long distance from home to muster; and rather than submit to that, I agreed to take the office. I was elected, but I *wouldn't treat*. But having the office, I had to get a uniform, and that bothered me. But at last I went to work and killed eighteen deer, divided the meat with my neighbours, dressed the skins, for some settler had told me how to do it, and I had saved the deer's brains, and had some tools of my father's, and when dressed, I took them to Connersville, and sold them for an *old epaulette and a sword* (great laughter). Many of you have seen me flourishing with these military accoutrements, and I need not describe them."

Mr. Samuel Frazier, the first newspaper carrier of Indianapolis, and the first *mail*, after giving some account of his emigration from Tennessee, which he left for a dislike to slavery, walking 450 miles to reach Indianapolis, thus offsets the military honours of Mr. McFarland:

"I was once elected to a military office—first sergeant—and, unlike Mr. McFarland, I *did* treat. I treated out three bottles of whiskey, and the boy that carried it round said that such a man to treat would certainly some day be a captain. I thought if the office could be bought with liquor I would be a captain; but before a vacancy occurred I became a temperance man, and have been ever since."

A new feature was now added to the meeting, which we give in the words of the local historian:

"At this point a party of young ladies, who had slipped out of the house unperceived, and taken a circle away around the crowd, came up the walk, dressed in the clothes of the early days. Their scanty proportions, short waists, or rather no waists, and straight sleeves, contrasting with the voluminous skirts and ample material (except about the bosom) of our present fashions, created a good deal of merriment. The crowd gathered about the 'show,' and stopped the speaking for a few minutes. After all had seen their 'fill,' the speaker resumed."

We do not know that the military spirit of the early times will gain much credit by the characteristic anecdote related by Daniel Yandes, who related with a good deal of humour a fight which took place between old Mr. Townsend, a Quaker, and Gen. John Carr, State Agent. It was while Mr. Townsend was laying off his land. There was quite a company assembled together, and after all had drunk as much as they wanted, Townsend laid aside the "Quaker" for awhile. He was pretty well "corned," and ready for mischief. Some one proposed, very gravely, that they have a *fight*, and the idea was thought a first rate one (great laughter). Carr and the Quaker were the combatants selected, and, after a pretty good contest, the Quaker *whipped the General*.

We will give but a single extract more, from Mr. James Blake. Mr. Blake said he would relate some of the incidents of the times of 1821, concerning some of his friends:

"I have got here," said Mr. Blake, "the first docket of the first Justice in this County, Mr. Maxwell. In those days Courts was held out of doors, the Squire sitting in the door of his house as the place of honour. There was but one lawyer, and he had to be always present, to enlighten the Court on matters of law. When the evidence was in, the Squire, to get his counsel with the lawyer, would light his pipe and say he would walk about and think of the matter. As he went out of the door he would give the lawyer a wink and walk round the house to the right hand, while the lawyer would saunter off to the left hand, and thus the two would meet and hold a consultation behind the chimney. The Squire would then return and render judgment. The jury would go into the woods and sit around upon the logs, about where Dr. Cook's house now is, to make up their verdict. There was no jail nearer than Connersville, and the constable used to summon the '*posse commitatus*' to help him take the culprit to jail. Then there would be great times. One man would have no saddle, another no bridle, another no horse, another neither horse, saddle nor bridle, and each would have to borrow the missing article of somebody else to make up the necessary accoutrements for travelling. Then the guard would meet on the appointed day, with their guns and horses, and make all ready for a start. Once," said Mr. Blake, "when thus situated, just ready to start, we heard a cracking among the bushes, and looking about, found that the prisoner, finding the guard thinking more of themselves than him, had broke for the timber. They shouted and fired at him, but he got away. That was the way the legal business of the country was managed then. Mr. Fletcher was the indispensable lawyer (laughter), and his hand-writing could be seen on nearly every page of the dockets."

These incidents, and many others which might be gatered up, will increase in interest as time rolls on. This same excellent man, James Blake, once said to us that the first year he lived in Indianapolis he used about once a week to go down to White River, about a mile distant, to look up and see the sky. In town, the forests were too dense for such a luxury!

Why should not pains be taken in all our Western cities to collect and record the incidents of early times? They are precious legacies, fast fading away. Every man who dies carries down a history with him as well worth knowing as the lost volumes of classic writers. We especially desire that, next year, pains should be taken to bring out the early religious labours of Christian men in Indianapolis. No man can estimate the debt which subsequent times will owe to the tenacious fidelity of a few Christian men, some of whom yet live.—*H. W. Beecher, in The Independent.*

For the Anti-Slavery Standard.

INVOCATION.

O SUMMER trees in leafy greenness glowing
'Neath golden rays,
You fill my soul with beauty to o'erflowing
These summer days;
O let me, bee-like, 'mong your leaves and flowers
Gather all sweetness for the Winter hours.

Ye revel in life's bliss or wo unfearing,
And joy to greet
The breeze's kiss, or the wild storm's careering
Since both are meet.
O let me wander in your cloistered bowers,
And nerve my soul to meet the Winter hours.

Beautiful trees that lift your boughs so queenly,
In golden air!
Would I might rise as ye, and smile serenely
On earthly care:
And welcome chilling storms as Summer showers,
And make a May-time of the Winter hours.

O shed your dews upon me, cool the fever
Of my sad heart!
I'm weary of unrest, the gloom will never
From life depart—
And the clouds gather, the fierce storm lowers
Which usher in the long, drear Winter hours.

Through the still forest paths I wander lonely
And ye are there;
Ye lift my soul up till it sees ye only
And breathes a prayer—
That the calm peace it finds in those loved bowers
May give it strength to meet the Winter hours.

T. E. D.

CURIOUS EXPERIMENT IN BOTANY.

IN Sicily there grows a wild grass, which, when ripe, at the end of summer, is gathered by the peasantry, tied in bundles, and set on fire; not, however, to be consumed, but for a mere scorching. The flame flies rapidly through the light husks and beard of the plant, and leaves the seeds slightly roasted, in which state they are eaten with considerable relish by numbers of the rural population. What the Sicilians do with their grass might be done with other grasses, and in other countries, were it not that the seeds generally are too small to repay the trouble of producing them for food. If all were but as large as those of the maize, or even wheat and barley, we should hear but few complaints of dear bread. Instances, indeed, are on record of grass-seeds having been largely eaten in times of scarcity, and with the desired effect of sustaining life, for all are more or less floury.

The botanical name of the Sicilian grass above mentioned is *Ægilops*, or goat's-eye—the Greeks having believed it to be a remedy for a disease that appears in one corner of the eye. There are three or four species growing all around the Mediterranean, as well as in the islands, chiefly in the hot, dry, sandy plains near the sea. They flourish even on the scorched volcanic soils, in strange contrast to the prevalent aridity, showing the vital principle to be in them unusually energetic, and proof against extremes of heat. Moreover, the *Ægilops ovata*, as though sporting with its powers, shoots out another species, the *Triticoides*, or wheat-like, from one and the same root; not by artificial cultivation, be it understood, but spontaneously. Clearly, these goat-eyes are remarkable plants, and as we shall see presently, they have been experimented on with remarkable results.

M. Fabre, an enlightened agriculturists, of Agde, in the South of France, considering these grasses to belong to the cerealia, began a series of careful experiments on the *Ægilops ovata*, with a view to ascertain what effect would be produced upon it by cultivation. A plot of ground, sheltered by high walls, and sufficiently distant from the fields of grass and other gramina, was prepared, and in this he sowed a few seeds in 1838. The plants grew from twenty to twenty-four inches high, and ripened by the middle of July in the following year; and though with but few fertile spikelets, the yield was in the proportion of *five* to *one*. Here was already a difference, best understood when we remember that in its wild state the *Ægilops* seldom grows higher than from six to nine inches with curved stalks, bearing a small flat rudimentary ear containing one or two grains. The stalks are extremely brittle, and when fully ripe the ears turn black and fall off, like the leaves from a tree. In these latter respects, M. Fabre's crop of 1839 retained its original habit, for the ears were deciduous, and the stalks broke easily; but we see a marked difference in height, and in amount of produce. The seeds were again sown; and in 1840, the spikelets were more numerous, scarcely an ear without two seeds, and these more floury than before, approaching the character of wheat. In 1841, the resemblance to wheat was still more observable; the ears, which were less flat, had from two to three grains, and the awns or beard had almost disappeared. In the next year, the plants stood still, being slightly attacked by rust; the number of grains, however, was not diminished. But in 1843, the delay was made up: the stalks grew three feet high, and stronger than in any previous season; the ears could not be easily broken off; the grains were plump; and one of the plants yielded 380 for 1; another, 450 for 1. In 1844, every ear was full, and the grains not so densely coated as before; and in 1845, M. Fabre considered the transformation into wheat (*triticum*) complete: all the plants were true representatives of cultivated wheat.

Here, then, in seven years, we have a change effected by artificial means, which may be regarded as one of the most extraordinary phenomena of cultivation. The brief account we have given of the history of the experiments, shows by what a gradual progress a wild and comparatively useless grass was converted into one of our most valuable cereals; and more than this, the question as to the origin of wheat may now be considered as settled. Botanists have long repeated the statements, that our cultivated wheat once grew wild in Sicily, Babylonia and Persia; and here we have the explanation. No need now to assume the existence of a distinct variety; and already the first scientific agriculturist of France have come to the conclusion, that cultivated wheat, *tritica*, are only races of *Ægilops*.

Since 1845, M. Fabre has sown the seed, obtained with so much care, in an open field among vineyards by the roadside, and with a return of six or eight fold. The stems are straight and strong; the ears are round and beardless; the grains very floury; and in no single instance has there been any return to the form of the original *Ægilops ovata*. After this, who shall say what may or may not be effected by cultivation? The bearded wheat of Egypt is known to lose its beard when cultivated in England; and in some places the country people have a notion that our own wheat is changed into rye-grass in wet summers. This may be an error; but one thing is certain, that the more wheat is treated as a biennial, the better is the result.—*Chambers's Journal.*

THE subject of the following poetical effusion was a pious coloured man who appears to have belonged to a family of slaves in North Carolina, who are now in a process of emancipation by the active exertions of their master and mistress. The poem is the production of the latter.—*Friends' Review.*

UNCLE ISHAM.

One less is left to love us here—the good old man is gone;
But still he points us to the Rock he loved to rest upon;
One less to warn us what to do and what to leave undone;
But still he animates our souls the Christians race to run.

Through years he loved to labour as a happy child loves play—
He loved the garden, loved the corn, and loved the new-mown hay;
He made a pet of everything by Nature's bounty given;
He looked on Nature as herself the work and gift of Heaven.

Through years we saw him daily fed by his own household band—
His head stooped low to meet the cup in loving childhood's hand;
And by this utter helplessness we saw him sorely tried,
Yet bowed in sweet humility before the Crucified.

We saw him robed in holiness—we saw him filled with love
For all who dwell beneath the skies—for Him who reigns above;
O, how his soul was feasting on the Bread of Life Divine!
And drinking of the blessed cup that flows with heavenly wine!

We saw him silent—fearing still to speak the Holy Name;
But when the Spirit bade him spread abroad the Saviour's fame,
We saw his withered arms upraised, we heard his earnest prayer,
That every soul upon the earth his Saviour's grace might share.

We heard his gospel messages—we heard his glorious Psalm
Of "Praises! Praises evermore to God and to the Lamb!"
And in his silent ecstacies we saw the tear-drops stand
In those dim eyes he could not reach with his poor palsied hand.

His God hath wiped those tears away, that hand hath power to hold
The waving palm of victory, the thrilling harp of gold;
The brow that looked all meekness here, now wears a radiant crown,
That evermore before the Throne of Glory boweth down!

We miss him when we seem to tread the narrow path alone—
We miss his fitly-spoken words, we miss their touching tone;
For every chord within his breast was so attuned by love,
We miss the music of his voice as we would miss a dove.

We miss him when a blessing comes we wish with him to share,
And when a fiery trial comes, we miss his fervent prayer;
But, Saviour! when we draw toward Thee, his words salute our ear,
"We cannot get too near the Lord—we cannot get too near!"

So, like some sweet, confiding child, he loved on Thee to rest,
With thy own robe of righteousness so folded round his breast,
That even death's dread arrow fell so hurtless by Thy side,
We think of him as one who lives, and not as one who died.

And when before the mercy seat we sometimes dare to kneel,
So poor in spirit, that a sense of want is all we feel,
Thy quickening Spirit bids us ask, "dear Saviour, let us be
Still more like him—for then we shall be more and more like Thee!"

HISTORICAL REMINISCENCES—FLORIDA BONDS AND COL. GAMBLE.

To the Editor of The New York Tribune.

SIR: Happening to see, in a copy of the *Tribune*, now some months old, a mention of the rejection by the Mixed Commission at London of the claim made against the United States by the unfortunate English holders of the Florida Bonds, I am reminded that I am able to give the private history of the origin of those bonds, which may prove both entertaining and edifying, and which, if I omit to write it out, no other person, perhaps, will ever put upon paper.

Those bonds originated solely and exclusively with the late Col. John G. Gamble, the father of the young lady of whom Mr. Wikoff has lately made a heroine. Mr. Gamble was a remarkable man. He was a Virginian by birth, of Scotch-Irish descent, and had, in a remarkable degree, those peculiarities both of features and character which so plainly distinguish our citizens of this Scotch blood from those of pure English origin. Mr. Gamble's grandfather settled originally, if I mistake not, in Pennsylvania, but was one of those immigrants from that State by whom the original settlers of the Virginia Valley were supplanted, and driven to seek their fortunes still further west, selling out their improvements in the Valley to this superior and more thrifty class.

Mr. Gamble's father removed to Richmond, where he became a leading merchant, and where his two sons (John and Robert) became associated with him in business. The Gambles were ardent Federalists. John G., then quite a young man, accompanied the late Chief Justice Marshall, as his private secretary, when he went to France in 1798, as one of the famous X. Y. Z. Mission. The following story I had from Mr. Gamble's own lips. When Aaron Burr was arrested and brought to Richmond, charged with treason, it was given out by Jefferson's friends that nobody would dare become bail for him. As a Federalist and an admirer of Hamilton, Mr. Gamble detested Burr; but when he heard this brag of the Democrats, he offered himself as one of Burr's bail. Burr afterward wished to wait upon him to thank him for this service, but he declined the interview, stating that what he had done had not been done as a private favour, but merely as a public protest against an attempt at official oppression.

Mr. Gamble, who had all the *perfervida vis* of a Scotchman, became, early in life, implicated in a duel—I think, however, not on his own account, but as a second. The death of one of the parties to this duel made so deep an impression upon him that he not only foreswore duels for the future, but joined the Presbyterian Church, of which he continued a zealous member himself, regularly conducting private worship in his own family.

After the death of his first wife (the mother of *the* Miss Gamble, who was the only surviving child by that marriage), Col. Gamble married as a second wife a daughter of Gov. Greenup, of Kentucky, by whom he had a large family. A sister of his was the second Mrs. Wirt. Wm. Wirt, who was, in his youth, an ardent Jeffersonian, is said to have joined with other wild young men of the party in breaking the windows of the crabbed old Gamble, as they esteemed him, by way of showing their disapprobation of his high Federal politics; our ardent young Republican little thinking at that time that he would before long be seeking a wife out of the same house.

The embargo, the war with England, and the commercial revulsions which followed that war, broke down the mercantile firm of the Gambles, as it did almost every mercantile house in the country; and Col. John G. Gamble and his brother Robert, both with large and growing families on their hands, were thus driven to seek some other business. They became engineers or contractors, or both, on the James River Canal, and, when that was finished, were among the earliest emigrants to Florida—I think about the year 1825 or 1826—then proclaimed as the Planters' Paradise. They carried with them some fifty slaves apiece, and settled on two adjoining plantations about twenty miles west of Tallahassee. Col. John called his plantation *Wakenah*, an Indian word of which I don't know the meaning. Col. Robert called his Willaune, Seminole for "yellow water" from the name of a brook which ran through it. They were accompanied by Mr. Randall, the husband of the eldest daughter of Mr. Wirt, a very beautiful and accomplished woman, whose early death, leaving a number of young children, was a severe loss to the circle of which she was the life and the ornament. Her husband—a Marylander by birth, and every way a gentleman—had been, during the war with England, an officer in the army, but, having, before or after, studied the law, Mr. Wirt had obtained for him the appointment of Territorial Judge for the Middle District of Florida. Mrs. Randall rejected the Indian name of her husband's plantation, and insisted upon calling it *Belleview*.

Mr. Wirt himself also entered a plantation, not in the immediate vicinity of the three above mentioned, but about twenty miles to the north, on the shore of Lake Mirosakee. He had a project in his head of raising cotton by free labour, and thus of abolishing slavery, and, with this view, got a number of French and Swiss to come to Florida to work as labourers on his plantation. But his project did not succeed. In a short time they all left and squatted about in the woods on plantations of their own. This plantation, which the family called *Wirtland*, was, I believe, almost the only property which Mr. Wirt, at his death, left behind him. The Cherokees, whose cause against the State of Georgia he had generously, but unavailingly, pleaded before the Supreme Court of the United States, made his family a present of $10,000, and this money, by the advice of Col. John Gamble and other friends, was laid out in stocking Wirtland with slaves.

The slaves bought for this purpose had belonged to Achille Murat, eldest son of the King of Naples, who, along with Mr. Gadsden (our present Minister to Mexico), had been one of the first settlers of Middle Florida, and both of whom had plantations three or four miles west of Col. Gamble's, being so much nearer Tallahassee. Murat called his plantation Lipona, being Napoli (the Italian for Naples), with the syllables transposed. The French Revolution of 1838 had then just occurred; and Murat—who had married a Miss Willis, from Alexandria, a grand-niece of Washington, and a very beautiful and sensible woman, who had selected him from among a multitude of suitors, she having been one of the first female immigrants to Middle Florida—thinking that the time of the Bonaparte restoration had come (he was some twenty years too early), hastened to sail for Europe. To raise funds for which purpose, he was obliged to sell off about half his negroes, who were bought, as I have mentioned, to stock Wirtland, and the plantation thus stocked passed under the superintendence of Captain (then Lieutenant) Goldsborough, of the navy, who had married another daughter of Mr. Wirt.

But, although Col. Gamble was himself a slaveholder and had recommended the stocking of Wirtland with slaves, he belonged in common with Wirt, to that old but now almost extinct Virginian school which regarded slavery not only as a great evil, but as an evil to which some end must speedily be put. At least such were his opinions when I first became acquainted with him. He was a great friend of Mercer, the father of the Colonization Society, and was a warm supporter of that plan (which he regarded as a step towards the abolition of slavery), having liberated a favourite servant and sent him out among the first emigrants. It was curious to hear him and Col. Murat (Murat was called Colonel in Florida, and, in fact, according to his own account, his father had made him a Colonel of Cavalry when he was a mere boy) discuss the question of slavery. Murat was, or professed to be, as may be seen by two curious books that he published, a great Democrat; but he regarded the negroes as an inferior race, and, therefore, for the present, properly kept in servitude. Presently, however, so he thought, everything would be put right by the rapid progress of amalgamation of the races: which by removing the distinction of colour, would in due time bring slavery to an end. The French view of the subject was quite odious to Col. Gamble, who looked upon amalgamation with the feelings of a Virginian and Presbyterian. He was in favour of speedy emancipation, though he thought that it would be necessary to provide a Liberia either in Africa, or by buying a part of what is now Texas, to which to send the negroes. He insisted, however, with great energy, that this pretended inferiority of the negroes was untrue, and, that giving them equal opportunities of improvement, and they were every way equal to the whites. I have heard him, too, intimate to his family that if slavery were abolished, it would be rather an advantage than otherwise to men like himmen, that is, of energy, enterprise and head. In that case he would not be a planter, but a hundred occupations would be opened to him, such as did not now exist in the South, and which would not exist so long as slavery left no room except for planters and slaves. This, however, was at a time when the price of cotton was down and the prospect of planters not very encouraging. Afterwards cotton rose, and with that rise I could notice a very decided decline in Col. Gamble's anti-slavery zeal. Being at his house one day during the great excitement of 1835—the first outburst of pro-slavery reaction against the Abolitionists—he expressed himself with great vehemence against those Northern agitators, and declared that if he had Garrison there with a rope about his neck—this was just about the time of the famous Boston mob of "gentlemen of property and standing" and I think it was the account given in the newspapers of that very proceeding which led to this very conversation—he would be one of the first to help string him up to a tree. Miss Ellen Wirt, Mr. Wirt's youngest daughter, and a very beautiful and accomplished girl she was, who was present, ran playfully up to the indignant planter, and putting one arm about his neck and her hand on his mouth, exclaimed: "Uncle John! how can you, a Christian man, say so?" Nevertheless, Uncle John insisted that he would do it, and I am not altogether certain that he would n't. Almost all the Scotch-Irish, unless tempered by intermixture, have a wild fierceness about them which makes them great hands for Lynch law.

But all this is carrying me a great way from the Florida bonds, to which it is now time to turn. In the times of the low price of cotton which followed Col. Gamble's removal to Florida he turned his attention to all other kinds of culture. He planted a vineyard, having as his vinedresser one of Mr. Wirt's Frenchmen, who had served with honour under Bonaparte in the invasion of Russia, and understood vine-dressing thoroughly, according to the French fashion, but could not make it serve in Florida. The Colonel also tried sugar-planting, much to the satisfaction of his negroes, to whom the molasses—and he made more molasses than sugar—was served out as part of their weekly allowance. And here let me add, that he greatly excited the ire of his South Carolina neighbours, of whom there were several besides Col. Gadsden, by allowing his negroes three pound of bacon a week, whereas the only allowance given by the South Carolinians was a bare peck of corn. In truth, both he and his neighbours found it very difficult to make both ends meet, and their credit with the Tallahasse shopkeepers was not at all times the best.

In this state of things Col. Gamble one day met in a newspaper with an account of one of the Louisiana Property Banks got up about that time to furnish funds to the planters to buy slaves with. It immediately struck him that was just the scheme to relieve the pressing wants of himself and his neighbours. He went forthwith to work, got an act through the Territorial Legislature, and thereupon posted off to New York to sell his bonds.

It had been proved by a hundred previous experiments in England and this country, many of them more than a hundred years old, that banks to lend money to farmers for investment in permanent improvements are impracticable for the plain and simple reason that the money once lent out in this way does not come back again, so that very soon the bank has nothing to lend, and nothing even to redeem its own bills with. In general, however, our money-lenders, and the English money-lenders, know little or nothing of the past beyond the limits of their own experience, and they easily fall into some new trap.

These property-banks, and the Union Bank of Florida among the rest, were got up in this way. The stock was subscribed by the planters, and to pay it they gave mortgages of their lands and negroes, as rated by appraisers appointed from among themselves, at prices a good deal above the real value. To furnish a cash capital to operate upon, the Territory issued bonds to the amount originally of one million of dollars, which amount was afterward increased. The bank was to pay the interest on these bonds, and to take them up at their maturity, failing which the holders had the Territory to look to.

These Florida bonds were among the earliest of the flood of such securities within the last five and twenty years put upon the market. They were taken by Prime, Ward, King & Co., of New York, who sold them again in London. The bank was organized, Colonel Gamble was chosen President, and all the stockholders being entitled to loans of a certain amount on the pledge of their stock, considered their fortunes as already made. Simultaneously with the organization of the bank took place a rise in the price of cotton which soon carried that article to double the old rates. Every cent that could be borrowed was spent to buy slaves with. All the produce of the Florida bonds, and all the notes that could be got into circulation were lent out by the bank for that purpose. The ideas of banking entertained by the stockholders, or rather the single idea they had on the subject was, that for every dollar of the capital the bank was entitled to issue two dollars of paper. Upon that idea they acted, and of course it is not to be wondered at that after the stoppage of specie payments in 1837, the Union Bank of Florida never found itself in a condition to resume.

The inducement of the Territorial Legislature to guarantee the bonds had been the promise of a certain share of the net profits to go in aid of the Territorial school fund. I recollect that on the strength of this expected accession of means, Colonel Gamble called upon me one day to draw up a scheme for a system of common schools for the Territory. But so far from any net profits to accrue to the school fund, the bank presently could not find the means to pay even the interest on the bonds; and when the mortgages given by the stockholders came to be looked up it was found that the greater part of the mortgaged slaves—the only saleable part of the security—either were merely imaginary persons from the first, no traces being discovered that the Dicks, Toms and Harrys mentioned in the mortgages ever had existed at all, or else that they were dead, or that the owners, left in possession and foreseeing what was coming, had run off with them to Texas or elsewhere.

Beside the bonds there was also a great mass of discredited notes to which the Territorial Legislature, after repudiating all responsibility for the bonds, gave the final coup-de-grace by repealing the charter of the Bank. To this, however, the stockholders who were also the principal debtors of the bank, had no objection, as they were thus able (such of them as pretended to pay at all) to buy up the notes of the bank at a great discount, with which to discharge their own debts.

The bank lingered along for some years with Colonel Gamble still at the helm, collecting what could be got from the fragments. What the final catastrophe was I cannot state, as I had previously left Florida. The bondholders, however, never got anything except the lesson that to lend money to buy slaves with is a dangerous speculation, unless some better security can be had than plantation mortgages and territorial indorsements.

Florida, when organized as a State, took care to wash her hands of the whole transaction, and notwithstanding these repudiated territorial bonds, she is paraded in the Brokers' list as a State that owes no debt.

Your obedient servant,
A NORTHERNER.

New York, July 10, 1855.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

WAITING FOR PREFERMENT.—I think Lord Grey will give me some preferment if he stays in long enough; but the upper parsons live vindictively, and evince their aversion to a whig ministry by an improved health. The Bishop of ——— has the rancour to recover after three paralytic strokes, and the Dean of ——— to be vigorous at eighty-two. And yet these are men who are called Christians!—*Sydney Smith*

——TO THE CZAR.—By the last American mail, a newspaper arrived at Liverpool, addressed to "Zar Alexander, Esq., Emperor of Rooshie, Rooshie, Europe." The sorting-clerk at Liverpool, probably mistaking the address for Ross-shire, sent the paper in the Liverpool bag to Inverness, whence it had to be sent southwards again. We hope the contents may please the potentate, for whom, we presume, it is intended.—*Inverness Courier.*

——A WORD OR TWO CONCERNING FEMALE EDUCATION.—Ah! what female heart can withstand a red-coat? I think this should be a part of female education; it is much neglected. As you have the rocking-horse to accustom them to ride, I would have military dolls in the nursery, to harden their hearts against officers and red-coats. * * * Never teach false morality. How exquisitely absurd to tell girls that beauty is of no value, dress of no use! Beauty is of value; her whole prospects and happiness in life may often depend upon a new gown or a becoming bonnet, and if she has five grains of common sense she will find this out. The great thing is to teach her their just value, and that there must be something better under the bonnet than a pretty face for real happiness. But never sacrifice truth.—*Sydney Smith.*

——INFLUENCE OF CLIMATE ON THE COLOUR OF MANKIND.—For 1800 years the Jewish race has been dispersed into different latitudes and climates, and they have preserved themselves most distinct from any intermixture with the other races of mankind. There are some Jews still lingering in the valleys of the Jordan, having been oppressed by the successive conquerors of Syria for ages—a low race of people, and described by trustworthy travellers as being as black as any of the Ethiopian races. Others of the Jewish people, participating in European civilization, and dwelling in the northern nation, show instances of the light complexion, blue eyes, and the light hair of the Scandinavian families. We see, then, how to account for the differences of colour without having to refer them to original or specific distinctions.—*Professor Owen.*

——THE MANCHESTER ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AND THE LATE J. B. ESTLIN, ESQ., OF BRISTOL.—At a special meeting of the Committee of the above Society, held on Wednesday evening last, W. Oldham, Esq., Treasurer, in the chair, it was proposed by Mr. W. Stokes, seconded by Mr. Freestun, and resolved unanimously: "That this Committee have heard with profound regret of the decease of their honoured friend J. B. Estlin, Esq., late of the city of Bristol. Having long known him as the liberal and unwavering friend of the oppressed slave, whose rights he ably advocated by his pen and supported by his generosity, and for whose emancipation he laboured, 'in season and out of season,' to the close of an active life; this Committee cannot allow the mournful occasion to pass without recording their high sense of his virtues, and their conviction of the heavy loss which the anti-slavery cause has sustained by his removal from the scene of his early labours. And while bowing in the spirit of resignation to his will who is the sole disposer of life, they would express their sincere sympathy with his bereaved family and circle, with an earnest desire that the event may be regarded in the light of a solemn call to supply, by increased zeal in this great work, the place of him who has been removed to his high reward." At the above meeting Mr. W. Stokes was unanimovsly chosen Secretary, in the place of the Rev. W. Parkes, who has been compelled to resign on account of his numerous engagements.

——DUELLING.—There have been two or three men in our own world almost as wise as M. Jules Janin. "If thou art weary of life," said Marius to the bold Teuton who challenged him, "go and hang thyself." Themistocles was no coward, and yet he would rather take a blow than neglect of good counsel from Eurybiades. In later times, the Count of Savoy challenged the Dauphin of Viennois. "Hark ye, Sir Count," said the lusty Dauphin, "I will send you one of my wild bulls; and, if you be so minded, you may struggle till you are tired with an antagonist not easily overcome." We suppose that M. Janin will not dispute the bravery and gallant bearing of Turenne; and yet, according to the critic, the hero of Sintzheim and the Rhine must be a lost man in the eyes of all the sections into which M. Janin divides the world, for Turenne refused to fight a duel under the grossest of provocations. He had been subjected to a disgusting insult by a rash young officer, and as quickly drew his sword to resent as the other to defend it. But Turenne thrust his weapon back into the sheath, remarking as he did so: "Young man, if I could wipe your blood from my conscience as easily as I have wiped the filthy proof of your folly from my face, I would take your life upon the spot." M. Janin is an exceedingly clever person, but we very much doubt if even he will be able to persuade his countrymen that the Turenne who fell so gloriously at Salzbach, in front of the artillery of Montecuculi, was a coward for refusing to avenge an insult by a crime.—*Athenæum.*

——DEATH OF MR. JAMES SILK BUCKINGHAM.—This well-known lecturer and writer died, on Saturday, at his residence, Stanhope Lodge, Upper Avenue-road, after a severe and protracted illness. Not many months since, the deceased commenced an "Autobiography," which promised to be exceeding voluminous. The portion published sufficed to show that the career of the author had been singularly chequered and adventurous. Mr. Buckingham was in his early days at sea, in an humble capacity. He afterwards became connected with journalism in India, travelled over the greater part of the world, and returning to England, acquired some fame as a lecturer, and grew conspicuous by his connection with various philanthropic schemes, many of which were looked upon as impracticable. In 1832, he was M.P. for Sheffield, and continued to represent that constituency until 1837. While in Parliament he was active in promoting the Temperance Movement, and was instrumental in obtaining the committee at whose instance the well-known medical evidence respecting intoxicating liquors was collected. His connection with the British and Foreign Institute, and the ridicule with which many of his proceedings were visited by *Punch*, will not be forgotten. Lately, since his name was placed on the pension list, Mr. Buckingham has not taken an active part in any public life. As a lecturer, he possessed many advantages, his voice and manner being extremely well suited for oratorical display. He was also fluent and animated, and gifted with a lively imagination. He died in his 69th year.

——In an interesting article, in the *Athenæum*, on "Sculpture in the United States," we have the following remarks on the production of modern sculpture generally: "As far as mere execution is concerned, the sculptor's art is of all others the easiest of attainment. Viewed in this light, it falls among the lowest handicrafts. Even machinery is now successfully employed in cutting marble to almost any required form; and it is no more ingenious than that which turns our lasts of every shape from a simple block of wood. Indeed, so little artistic skill is necessary in the mere execution of statuary, that the sculptor need not touch it. His art is higher and nobler, dealing with things of feeling, imagination and philosophy, and bringing them into visible forms in the most manageable substance he can find, such as clay, or wax, or any other which shall readiest receive the impress of his thought—and here his work is done. His fortune is left for other hands to gain for him by mechanical means alone, by transferring to any required dimensionss the perishable model to enduring bronze or marble. Thus, a figure of fifty feet in height costs little more of the sculptor's time or talent than one of three feet. Copy after copy may be made to any number, without even the supervision of the artists eye; so that if he choo